

तमसो मा ज्योतिर्गमय

SANTINIKETAN
VISWA BHARATI
LIBRARY

922.76

1 T24

V.1.

WORKS BY
ARCHBISHOP TEMPLE

Crown 8vo. 6s.

THE RELATIONS BETWEEN RELIGION AND
SCIENCE.

Extra Fcap. 8vo. 4s. 6d.

SERMONS PREACHED IN RUGBY SCHOOL
CHAPEL.

Extra Fcap. 8vo. 6s.

SERMONS PREACHED IN RUGBY SCHOOL
CHAPEL. Second Series.

Extra Fcap. 8vo. 6s.

SERMONS PREACHED IN RUGBY SCHOOL
CHAPEL. Third Series.

8vo. Sewed. 1s. net.

A CHARGE DELIVERED AT HIS FIRST
VISITATION.

8vo. Sewed. 1s. net.

THE RESERVATION OF THE SACRAMENT.
May 1, 1900.

MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD., LONDON.

Frederick Temple
Archbishop of Canterbury





• Mother and Son

Memoirs of Archbishop Temple

BY
SEVEN FRIENDS

EDITED BY
E. G. SANDFORD
ARCHDEACON OF EXETER

WITH PHOTOGRAPHURE AND OTHER ILLUSTRATIONS

IN TWO VOLUMES
VOL. I

London
MACMILLAN AND CO., LIMITED
NEW YORK : THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.
1906

All rights reserved

First Edition, February 1966.
Reprinted, March 1966.

P R E F A C E

MODERN life moves quickly, and individual action and figure are soon forgotten ; but Frederick Temple is one of those who belong not to his own generation, but to all time, and the legacy of his life and character must not be lost. These volumes are an attempt to avert such a misfortune. They constitute a series of memoirs, rather than a single memoir. Each of the seven, with the exception of the two last, covers a different period of the life, and each has been written by a different hand. The Canterbury period, which forms the subject of the two final memoirs, has been divided between two contributors, of whom one takes the Diocesan Episcopate and the other the Primacy.

The life of Dr. Temple lends itself to this treatment. Its different divisions are clearly marked and defined ; the mental characteristic of the man was breadth, and the fact that different types of mind are represented in the writers may help to preserve this feature of breadth in the general portrait. The subject of it was many-sided,

and a mistake would be made if the view presented were contracted.

It was characteristic of him that his sense of the dignity of individual life made him shrink from the thought of publicity being given to its more private history. These memoirs accordingly regard his life as far as possible under its more public aspects; they are not a biography, but records of a career.

That there are drawbacks to this method is obvious. The most valuable memory which Dr. Temple has left is his own personality: his claim to permanent remembrance was not brilliancy of achievement, but force of character; and it is through the inner history of life that character is known. That to which his fellow-men have a moral claim, and without which they will be the poorer, is a knowledge of the man Frederick Temple. In the first memoir and in the concluding section of these volumes an attempt is made, without any violation of trust, to supply this knowledge. The first memoir recalls the story of the home where the foundation of the character was laid; and the section added at the close of the book aims at binding together the whole life into a complete unity by tracing the training and self-development which ran throughout the different stages. In these two cases discriminating use has been made of Dr. Temple's personal correspondence—chiefly home letters and letters to a few friends.

In order that each contributor may give of his best, he has been left as free as possible, consistently with the limitations of the work, to tell his own tale. A certain amount of overlapping has been the inevitable consequence; it is hoped that the price of the additional freedom will be judged worth the payment. The result may remind readers somewhat of an old building in which many styles are mingled together without much attempt on the part of successive builders to make them fit into each other. The general effect is, however, sometimes fine; the building creates its own symmetry; it grows into unity of itself, and perhaps Archbishop Temple may be left to speak for himself; he is his own "epistle, known and read of all men."

In the name of all the Contributors the Editor thanks those who have lessened their labours by supplying the letters and memoranda which are found in the body of the work, and particularly the Bishop of Salisbury for his Appendix on the Reply to the Bull of Pope Leo XIII.

The Editor's own special thanks are due to Chancellor Edmonds for aid in the historical parts of the Exeter Memoir, to Prebendary Hingeston-Randolph for full liberty to refer to his valuable edition of the Exeter Episcopal Registers, and to Mr. Edmund Carlyon for information with respect to the revival of the Cornish Bishopric. Mr. A. Tilney Bassett has rendered great assistance as

Secretary in collecting, tabulating, and preparing materials, and is responsible for the Index. Miss E. A. Sandford has been an untiring Amanuensis. Mrs. Temple and the late Archbishop's sons, Frederick and William, are warmly thanked for their confidence and for effective co-operation and constant and generous interest. Of correspondences the most significant or continuous are connected with Dr. Temple's family, Dr. Scott, Canon Lawson, Lord Coleridge, Archbishop Benson, and Canon Cook. For permission to make use of the letters the Editor is indebted to the representatives of the friends named:—The Rev. Walter Scott, Mrs. Lawson, Amy Lady Coleridge, Mr. Arthur Benson, and Miss Jessie Montgomery.

No one can write about Dr. Temple without having it borne in upon him that he must write truthfully; but having seen all records, the Editor lays aside his work with deepened reverence for the memory of a good, great man and beloved friend.

E. G. SANDFORD,
EDITOR.

THE CLOSE,
EXETER, *December* 1905.

CONTENTS

MEMOIR OF EARLIER YEARS

1821-1848

By The Rev. J. M. WILSON, D.D., Canon of Worcester.

CHAPTER I

ANCESTRY

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Birth—Ancestry on the father's side—Ancestry on the mother's side | 3 |

CHAPTER II

LIFE IN THE IONIAN ISLANDS, 1821-1830

| | |
|---|----|
| Memoranda by Miss Temple—Archbishop's Reminiscences . | 16 |
|---|----|

CHAPTER III

LIFE AT AXON, 1830-1833

| | |
|---|----|
| Reminiscences by Miss Temple and the Archbishop—Major Temple, Governor of Sierra Leone—The Rev. J. Richey—The Rev. J. Blackmore | 23 |
|---|----|

CHAPTER IV

LIFE AT BLUNDELL'S SCHOOL, TIVERTON, 1834-1839

| | |
|--|----|
| Entry at school—Confirmation—Recollections—Scholarship . . | 29 |
|--|----|

CONTENTS

CHAPTER V

LIFE AS AN UNDERGRADUATE, 1839-1842

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Society of Balliol—Dr. Jowett's memoranda—Professor J. C. Shairp's poem—Letter of Dr. Scott—Miss Temple's reminiscences—Personal expenditure—Oxford Movement. W. G. Ward. Arthur Clough. Temple's attitude . . . | 39 |
| Appendix. Mathematical and scientific powers of Temple . . . | 58 |

CHAPTER VI

LIFE AS FELLOW AND TUTOR OF BALLIOL, 1842-1848

| | |
|---|----|
| Double first-class—College lecturer—Junior Dean—Ordination, 1846—Tract XC—Stanley's <i>Life of Dr. Arnold</i> —Ward's <i>Ideal of a Christian Church</i> —Growth of liberal spirit in Temple—Letters to his mother—His family at Oxford—Sympathy with social and educational movements—Reminiscences from the Rev. Lewis Campbell, M.A., LL.D.—Mr. C. S. Roundell—Sir W. J. Farrer—Dr. Hornby . . . | 63 |
|---|----|

MEMOIR OF THE EDUCATION OFFICE PERIOD, 1848-1857

By H. J. ROBY, M.A., Hon. LL.D.

CHAPTER I

EMPLOYMENT UNDER COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL

| | |
|--|----|
| Examiner in the Education Office—Principal of Kneller Hall—Letter of a former student of Kneller Hall—Domestic life at Kneller Hall—Inspector of Training Colleges . . . | 97 |
|--|----|

CHAPTER II

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY REFORM

| | |
|--|-----|
| Fellowships—Scholarships—Students' Aid Society . . . | 115 |
|--|-----|

CONTENTS

xi

CHAPTER III

NATIONAL ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Dr. Temple's contribution to the <i>Oxford Essays</i> (1856) on National Education—His evidence before the Newcastle Commission (The Royal Commission on Popular Education, 1860)—Application of rates to National Education—Other means of financial support—Popular management—School grants—Religious settlement | 120 |

CHAPTER IV

UNIVERSITY LOCAL EXAMINATIONS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Examination of middle-class schools in the West (1857)—Adoption of the scheme for Oxford and Cambridge Local Examinations (1857-58) | 129 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER V

SCHOOLS INQUIRY COMMISSION

| | |
|---|-----|
| Appointment of the Commission (1864)—Report of the Commission (1868)—Organisation of Secondary Education—Endowments—Religious instruction—Secular instruction—Technical instruction—Girls' Schools—Grammar Schools—Endowed Schools Act (1869)—Evidence before the Secondary Education Commission (1894)—Summary of Dr. Temple's views | 133 |
|---|-----|

RUGBY MEMOIR, 1857-1869

By F. E. KITCHENER, Assistant Master at Rugby, 1862-1875

CHAPTER I

APPOINTMENT TO RUGBY

| | |
|---|-----|
| Election—Condition of the School—Dr. Goulburn | 151 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER II

HEADMASTER AND BOYS

| | |
|--|-----|
| Reminiscences by Mr. H. Lee Warner, Mr. B. E. Hammond, the Rev. Arthur Butler—Dr. Temple's views as to the curriculum of a public school | 157 |
|--|-----|

CONTENTS

CHAPTER III

DR. TEMPLE AND THE MASTERS

| | |
|--|-------------|
| Recollections of the Rev. Arthur Butler, Dr. Jex Blake, Mr. E. A. Scott, Canon J. M. Wilson—Masters' Meetings | PAGE 171 |
|--|-------------|

CHAPTER IV

REFORMS

| | |
|--|-----|
| Royal Commission on Public Schools and Public Schools Act— Dr. Temple's relations thereto—Consequential changes at Rugby | 184 |
|--|-----|

CHAPTER V

ORGANISATION

| | |
|--|-----|
| Enlargement of curriculum—Memorandum of Mr. Otto Gold- schmidt—Rearrangement of Forms—Article by Mr. Arthur Sidgwick | 196 |
|--|-----|

CHAPTER VI

SCHOOL GAMES

| | |
|---|-----|
| Football—Hare and hounds—Rifle corps—Athletics and char- acter | 207 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER VII

PREACHING AND THE CHAPEL

| | |
|--|-----|
| General character of the sermons—Good Friday and Easter Day sermons—Addresses before Communion—Annual Con- firmations— <i>Essays and Reviews</i> in relation to the school— Recollections of Dr. Percival | 215 |
|--|-----|

CONTENTS

xiii

CHAPTER VIII

HOME LIFE AT RUGBY

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| The home <i>régime</i> —Memorandum by the Bishop's nephew, Mr. W. O. Moberly—Dr. Temple's mother—Miss Temple and the Schoolhouse | 227 |

CHAPTER IX

LEAVING RUGBY

| | |
|---|-----|
| The last Sunday—The farewell concert—Subsequent connexion with the school | 235 |
| Appendix—Rugby sermon: Good Friday | 244 |

EXETER MEMOIR, 1869-1885

By The Venerable E. G. SANDFORD, M.A., Archdeacon of Exeter,
Canon of Exeter

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY—THE DIOCESE OF EXETER

| | |
|--|-----|
| Foundation of the See—Bishop Temple's early predecessors—Reformation—Eighteenth century—Nineteenth century . . . | 255 |
|--|-----|

CHAPTER II

THE COMING OF DR. TEMPLE TO EXETER

| | |
|---|-----|
| Letters of congratulation—Opposition on account of <i>Essays and Reviews</i> —Correspondence—Election—Confirmation—Consecration—Enthronement—Statement in Convocation . . . | 273 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER III

EARLY DAYS AT EXETER

| | |
|---|-----|
| The first tours—Blundell's School—Visits to towns | 307 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER IV

EDUCATIONAL POLICY

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Endowed Schools Act (1869)—Secondary Education (Schools Inquiry Commission)—Elementary education (Mr. Forster's Education Act, 1870)—The educational position in the Diocese of Exeter—The Bishop's schemes for meeting the situation | 329 |

CHAPTER V

DIOCESAN ORGANISATION

| | |
|--|-----|
| The principle of self-government—Rural Deaneries—Lay Conferences—Archdeaconries—Central Diocesan unity—Formation, constitution, and aims of the Diocesan Conference—Primary session of the Diocesan Conference—Formation of the General Committee of Religious Instruction | 350 |
|--|-----|

CHAPTER VI

THE REVIVAL OF THE CORNISH SEE

| | |
|---|-----|
| Early history of the Church in Cornwall—United Diocese—First efforts to revive the Cornish Bishopric—Advent of Bishop Temple—His work and residence in Cornwall—Discussion in the Exeter Diocesan Conference—Diocesan Committee and Lady Rolle's gift—Bill for the revival of the Cornish See—Appointment of Dr. Benson—His Consecration and Enthronement—Dr. Temple's Farewell to Cornwall | 375 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER VII

THE BISHOP AND THE CLERGY (*Ordinandi*)

| | |
|--|-----|
| Bishop Temple's relation to clerical life—First Ordination sermon—Bishop Temple's views on theological colleges—Bishop Phillpotts' studentships—Ordination Examinations—Notes and incidents—Ordinations at different centres | 404 |
|--|-----|

CONTENTS

xv

CHAPTER VII—*Continued*

THE BISHOP AND THE CLERGY (*Ordinati*)

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Patronage System—Discipline—Conferences with the clergy— Visitation charges—Quiet days—Personal relations with the clergy | 424 |

CHAPTER VIII

THE BISHOP AND THE PEOPLE (*Social Life*)

| | |
|--|-----|
| Presentation of pastoral staff—Private friendships—West of England Bank—Franco-German War—Soldiers and sailors— Temperance—Purity—Deceased Wife's Sister Bill—Good manners—Self-culture | 467 |
|--|-----|

CHAPTER VIII—*Continued*

THE BISHOP AND THE PEOPLE (*Spiritual Life*)

| | |
|---|-----|
| Church Extension in Plymouth—Plymouth Mission, 1877— “Priesthood” of the laity—Lay readers—Parochial Councils —Sacredness of lay life | 491 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER IX

THE BISHOP AT HOME

| | |
|---|-----|
| The Palace—The chapel—Home life—Miss Temple—Marriage— The Cathedral—Restoration—Reredos—Royal Commission on Cathedrals—Relation of the Cathedral to the Diocese— Amalgamation of city parishes—Tiverton parochial system . . . | 506 |
|---|-----|

CHAPTER X

THE BISHOP ABROAD

| |
|---|
| <i>In Convocation</i> : Early views of Convocation—Reception— <i>Essays and Reviews</i> —Athanasian Creed—Ecclesiastical Courts— Bishop's discretionary power—Ecclesiastical measures— Evangelistic work of the Church—Authorised Hymnal— |
|---|

| | PAGE |
|---|------|
| Manual of Family Prayer—Rogation Days—Agenda Paper for Convocation—Reception of Dr. Temple's translation to the See of London | 555 |
| <i>In the House of Lords</i> : Pluralities Act Amendment Act—Truro Bishopric—Church Patronage—National Education—Uni- versity Tests Bill—Opening of churchyards to Nonconformists —Marriage with the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill | 575 |
| <i>Relations with Public Schools and Universities</i> | 581 |
| <i>Bampton Lectures</i> | 582 |

CHAPTER XI

LAST DAYS AT EXETER

| | |
|---|-----|
| Ordinations during Episcopate—Confirmations—Church building and restoration—Foreign missions—Ritualism—Offer of the See of London—Farewell from clergy and laity—Retrospect | 585 |
|---|-----|

RETURN VISITS TO EXETER

| | |
|---|-----|
| Temperance—Religious education—Tiverton—Church extension, Plymouth and Exeter—Church Congress—Reception as Archbishop at Exeter | 603 |
|---|-----|

ILLUSTRATIONS

PHOTOGRAVURE PLATES

| | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| Mother and Son | <i>Frontispiece</i> |
| Master of Rugby | <i>To face page 151</i> |

OTHER ILLUSTRATIONS

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Blundell's School, Tiverton | <i>To face page 29</i> |
| Rugby | 171 |
| The South Tower of the Cathedral, Chapter House and Bishop's Palace, Exeter | 253 |

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

- Nov. 30, 1821. Birth of Frederick Temple.
1834. Entrance at Blundell's School.
1839. Commencement of Residence at Balliol.
1842. Double First Class.
1846. Ordained Deacon by Bishop Wilberforce.
1848. Examiner in the Education Office.
1850. Principal of Kneller Hall.
1855. H.M. Inspector of Training Schools.
1858. Headmaster of Rugby.
1860. Publication of *Essays and Reviews*.
1869. Consecration as Bishop of Exeter.
1885. Bishop of London.
1896. Archbishop of Canterbury.
Dec. 23, 1902. Death.

MEMOIR OF EARLIER YEARS

1821—1848

By The Rev. J. M. WILSON, D.D., Canon of Worcester

CHAPTER I

ANCESTRY

Birth—Ancestry on the father's side—Ancestry on the mother's side.

FREDERICK TEMPLE, the subject of the following memoir, was born on November 30, St. Andrew's Day, 1821, in Santa Maura, one of the Ionian Islands.

The Archbishop, in his later years, was described as "Granite on fire." If these elements were inherited, it is in his father's family that we shall find the "fire," and in the mother's the "granite."

The father of the Archbishop was Octavius Temple, born April 16, 1784, baptized August 13, 1785, at St. Gluvias, near Penryn, Cornwall, of which his father, W. J. Temple, was vicar. Octavius was sent to school at Liskeard in February 1796.¹

He got his commission as ensign in the 4th Foot in 1799, and served as lieutenant in the 4th and 48th, as captain in the 38th and 14th, and was

¹ In the last volume of W. J. Temple's diaries, which are in the possession of C. J. Powlett, Esq., he mentions, evidently with pleasure, under date July 23, 1796: "Octavius jumped out of the carriage conveying him to school, and obliged his conductor to return, still crying, and saying he should never see me again. . . . Nothing can be more amiable than his disposition." W. J. Temple died within a month of that incident.

advanced to the rank of Brevet-major on June 4, 1814.¹

His battalion was in the Ionian Islands in the autumn of 1819, where he was made sub-inspector of Militia. In 1820 he was appointed Resident in Santa Maura for the Lord High Commissioner, and was transferred to Corfu in 1828 as administrator of the ecclesiastical and municipal revenues of that island. In 1830 he returned to England, where he purchased a farm, Axon, near Culmstock in Devon. But on November 2, 1833, he accepted the Lieutenant-Governorship of Sierra Leone, and in the following month he was made also the general superintendent of the Liberated Africans' Department.

He died on August 13, 1834. In the despatch from the Secretary of State to the officer administering the government of Sierra Leone we read: "His Majesty has received with much regret the intelligence of Lieutenant-Governor Temple's death, and has been pleased to approve of the measures which were taken to honour the memory of that meritorious officer."

In 1805, apparently without the knowledge of his family, he married Dorcas, daughter of Richard Carveth, of Probus, near Truro, in Cornwall. Of this family an account will be given later.²

Octavius Temple was a most interesting man. He was gifted with a strong physique, great activity of mind and body, and had an imperious temper.

¹ His battalion, the 2nd, formed part of the force sent from Genoa to hold Marseilles during the Waterloo campaign. The 3rd Battalion of his regiment was at Waterloo. He was afterwards stationed in Malta, and in the Ionian Islands. (*Notes and Queries*, 9th series, xi. p. 263.)

² Anne Temple, his elder sister, writes to a friend on July 14, 1805: "Octavius is by this time married, but to whom I cannot tell you, as all the information I have received on the subject is contained in these words, 'I am going to be married immediately.' As to the name, quality, or fortune of the lady I am totally ignorant."

Old soldiers of his regiments who settled near him, in Devon used to speak of him as a martinet, but always with respect and admiration. The position of a Resident in the Ionian Islands was at that time one that required unusual firmness, discretion, and ability. The islands were in a very unsettled state, the natural result of their recent history. During most of the eighteenth century they had been misgoverned, partly locally by native chiefs, partly by administrators from Venice. They were taken from the Venetian Republic by Bonaparte; but in 1799 Corfu was wrested from the French by a combined Russian and Turkish force; and in the following year a republic of the seven islands was formed under the protection of Russia and the Porte. In 1807, at the Peace of Tilsit, they were given back to the French; but in 1814 they were restored to their independence, and formed into a state under the protection of Great Britain, the King being represented by a Lord High Commissioner, who resided at Corfu. In each island was a Resident appointed by the Lord High Commissioner. The military force occupying the islands at that time consisted of about 3000 British soldiers and four native regiments. The population of the islands was about 200,000.

Major Temple's children remembered him with great affection and entire confidence¹ as "a just and honourable man,² of an exceedingly passionate temper; passionate with his children for trifles, but for any confessed real fault, tender, pitiful, and forgiving. With his servants the same qualities

¹ Memoranda dictated by Miss Temple to Archdeacon Wilson at Cannes in 1888.

² Major Temple had been on one occasion entrusted with a case of jewels by a Pasha, who was afterwards killed. No claimant appeared, and no owner could be found. He gave them up to the Foreign Office; and it was said that he received no thanks. "It was worth more than jewels to be the son of such a man," as the Archbishop said.

were present. When we came to England he burnt with indignation at the state of the poor. He would say to the 'labourers that he could not bear to see them working so hard ; and may almost be said to have persecuted the farmers into giving allotments to their labourers."¹

He was a man of unusual force of character, original, impulsive, resolute ; an ardent reformer in matters of Colonial administration ; and for a time regarded by the authorities with no great favour. He was, in fact, one of those indispensable persons whose function it is to "make plain places rough," and to rouse the official mind to duties unperformed or unrecognised. This and others of his characteristics showed itself in more than one of his children.²

Major Temple's father, the grandfather of the Archbishop, was the Rev. William Johnston³ Temple, M.A., LL.B., born December 6, 1739, in Berwick-on-Tweed. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh, where began his intimate acquaintance with James Boswell, the biographer of Dr. Johnson. On leaving Edinburgh he took rooms in the Inner Temple ; but in 1768 he entered at Trinity Hall, Cambridge, lending his rooms in the Temple to his friend Boswell. "I found them," Boswell writes,⁴ "particularly convenient for me, as they were so near Dr. Johnson's." Within

¹ "He took a prominent part in the arrangements that had to be made about the allotments with the Dean and Chapter of Exeter, who were then large landowners, and lords of the manor at Axon. His name and signature appear in connection with this matter in the old vestry reports." (Letter from the Rev. T. S. Rundle, Vicar of Culmstock, April 14, 1903.)

² T. C. Down, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, of the Middle Temple, has made a special study of Major Temple's life and character from official and private documents.

³ Johnston in registers of birth and marriage. He himself signed as Johnson ; and in literary notices he appeared as Johnson. (See paper by Dr. Drake, *Notes and Queries*, 9th series, xi. p. 261.)

⁴ Boswell's *Life of Johnson*.

one week, in September 1766, he was ordained deacon and priest at Exeter, and was presented by a relative, Wilmot Vaughan, fourth Viscount Lisburn,¹ to the rectory of Mamhead near Exeter. He was married² at Berwick on August 6, 1767, after a long attachment, to Ann Stow, daughter of William Stow of Berwick, of a good Northumberland family, her mother being the sister of Sir Francis Blake, and her father the son of Fenwick Stow, Mayor of Berwick. Through his wife Mr. Temple inherited some property, Allerdean in North Durham. In 1776, apparently through the influence of Lord Lisburn, he was presented by the Hon. Dr. Keppell, Bishop of Exeter, to the valuable vicarage of St. Gluvias, near Penryn, where he died on August 13, 1796, aged fifty-six,³ his dearly loved wife having died in 1793, aged forty-six. She is described as unusually well read and of tenacious memory. His predecessor in that vicarage was the Rev. John Penrose, the grandfather of Mrs. Arnold. He died there at the age of sixty-three.

Octavius was the youngest of his eight children. The eldest daughter and third child, Anne, born July 7, 1772,⁴ acted as her father's amanuensis in his literary work. Shortly after her father's death, on November 29, 1796, she married the Rev. Charles Powlett, chaplain to the Prince of Wales, and afterwards rector of Winslade, Hants, whom she

¹ Dr. Drake states that Viscount Lisburn was the brother of Major-General John Vaughan, Governor of Berwick. He inherited the Mamhead property and advowson through his wife, daughter and heiress of Joseph Gascoyne Nightingale of Mamhead. Viscount Lisburn was first cousin once removed of Mr. Temple. (See *Dict. Nat. Biog.*, "Major-Gen. John Vaughan.")

² Kindly communicated by the Rector of Berwick.

³ The age is given as fifty in the *History of Cornwall* and on the monument.

⁴ Other children were Robert George, John James, Frederick, and Laura.

first met in 1790, and had ten children,¹ of whom four survived her death in 1827. She had possession of all her late father's papers, and Mr. Powlett appears to have taken them with him to France, where he resided at Outreau near Boulogne, and at Le Mans, from 1827 till his death at Brussels in 1834. This fact throws some light on the strange accident by which a packet of manuscript letters was discovered by Major Stone among some waste paper at Boulogne, and proved to be letters from Boswell to William Johnson Temple. They passed through various hands, and were eventually published by Bentley in 1857 as *Letters of James Boswell to the Rev. W. J. Temple*. They extend over the years 1758 to 1795, the year of Boswell's death.² These letters are very entertaining, and throw a flood of light on Boswell's character, and incidentally disclose some of the characteristics of his correspondent. They were very intimate, and wrote to one another with the greatest frankness. Mr. Temple, however, had no high opinion of Boswell. In his diary of May 25, 1782, he writes:—

Boswell irregular in conduct and manners, selfish, indelicate, thoughtless; no sensibility or feeling for others who have not his coarse and rustick strength and spirits.

There are other similar entries. Mrs. Temple much disliked Boswell.

It is plain that Mr. Temple was a man of great literary ability and taste. He was a scholar also,

¹ Her grandson, C. J. Powlett, Esq., of Rugby, late Bengal Civil Service, has kindly permitted me to use extracts he has made from diaries and letters of the family. From these we learn, among other incidents of the time, that she and her father stayed with Boswell for a time in London, and went to Warren Hastings' trial. They dine with Sir Joshua Reynolds. She sees some pictures by "a man they call Romney, only portraits"; and thinks "the company at Vauxhall vulgar." It is evident that in later years Boswell's influence on Mr. Temple was very mischievous, and that the home was not happy after Mrs. Temple's death.

² *Notes and Queries*, 2nd series, No. 72.

reading Greek and Latin, French, Italian, and Spanish with his children; and moved in the best literary and social circles in town and country. He was ambitious and excitable, but was disappointed, restless, and subject to fits of great depression. He was hampered at Mamhead by small means and money troubles—the living was worth only £80 a year; and it appears that he had to make pecuniary sacrifices on account of his father's and brother's misfortunes, and the bankruptcy of Mr. Fenwick Stow.¹

It is probable, too, that, though he was a sincerely religious man, his work in a small country parish, with very limited access to books, and the society of the neighbourhood, was not very congenial to him. After a dinner-party at a neighbouring house he writes: "Large party there; not amused, and time lost; nothing less interesting than the conversation of country gentlemen; seldom extends beyond their fields and acres. What does conversation consist of? Agreeable nothings; little characteristic anecdotes and stories; commendations of the wine and dishes, etc. How little worth remembering!" But the

¹ In one of the letters of this volume, also found in Nicholl's *Illustrations of Literature*, vol. vii. p. 320, Boswell writes from Geneva on December 26, 1764, to Sir Andrew Mitchell, Minister Plenipotentiary from the Court of Great Britain to the Court of Prussia, 1756-71: "The intention of this letter is to beg your interest in an affair which I have much at heart. My most intimate friend, the friend of my youth and the comfort of my being, is a Mr. Temple, of Trinity Hall, Cambridge. He is an Englishman, and I am an old Scot; but brothers were never more united than we are. His father was formerly Mayor of Berwick. He had an employment in the Customs, but by misfortune became bankrupt a year or two ago. My friend has a small estate from his mother. He has generously contributed more than the half of it towards the relief of his father, and has got the creditors to be satisfied; but his father has nothing to live upon."

The request was to give his father a post in the Customs or in some public office, and to obtain full pay for his brother Robert, who, having served in the Army under General Crawford, was then on half-pay.

noise and excitement of London were equally unwelcome; though he speaks of a pleasant "walk in the fields beyond Wimpole Street." He goes to Cambridge for study in 1780, but writes in his diary: "The libraries of Cambridge not well supplied with books: no studies in any credit there but mathematical ones."

His youthful essay (100 pages) on *The Clergy, their Studies, Recreations, Doctrines, and the Decline of their Influence*, attracted very favourable notice, and in particular that of Bishop Horne. He also published *Moral and Historical Memoirs*, pp. 424; *Observations on Popular Discontent*; *Letter to the Clergy respecting the County Library*; and *An Historical Essay on the Abuse of Unrestrained Power*.¹

He left unfinished what he meant to be the work of his life, a historical work on *The Rise and Decline of Modern Rome, or Rome under the Papacy*. He founded the Cornwall Library and Literary Society at Truro. He was a friend of Gray and Nicholls, and we find him dining frequently with Dr. Johnson and Goldsmith, Sir Joshua Reynolds, Malone, Wilkes, Burke, Sheridan, and many others, including Governor Penn and Paoli. It is Temple's estimate of the character of Gray that appears in Johnson's *Lives of the Poets*. Among his correspondents it is interesting to note the name of Hannah More.

Boswell visited Temple at Mamhead in 1775² or 1776, in company with Pascal Paoli, the General of the Corsicans. His letters throw light on many family matters. Miss Ann Stow

¹ See Boase and Courtney's *Bibliotheca Cornubiensis*.

² It was then that Boswell vowed to Paoli "under the venerable yew" in the churchyard that he would never again get drunk—a vow he failed to keep.

appears in his letters¹ as "your Berwick Celia." In December 1768 he writes: "I wish you joy of your son, and I most heartily accept the office of being its godfather. I give you my solemn promise that I shall be in earnest to do my duty."¹

In 1789 Bbswell writes: "I wish you joy of your young sailor's return." This was Francis, the second son, the future Admiral;² the eldest of the sons who survived their father, born July 28, 1770.³ In 1793 he writes: "I will do what I can as to John James and Octavius. I have good interest at Eton, and shall be there soon." John James went to Eton, and then into the army, and died in India in 1800. Octavius seems not to have gone to Eton.⁴ Another of the sons, Frederick, got a commission in the army and went to India. On the death of the Rev. W. J. Temple, his estate was equally divided among his children.

William Johnson Temple was the son of William Temple of Allerdean. Over the portico of the Town Hall of Berwick-on-Tweed still appear the words, "Finished 1754, William Temple, Esq., Mayor." He and his father George were both Presbyterians, of an old Berwick family, and were trustees of "The Low Meeting-House," the chapel of the Scottish Presbyterians, who were regarded in Berwick as dissenters. The ancestry of the Archbishop on the father's side is thus

¹ William Johnson (or Johnston), his eldest child, born August 13, 1768. He died early.

² Lieutenant, 1793; Commander, 1803; Captain, 1805; Retired Rear-Admiral, 1837; Vice-Admiral, 1847; Admiral, 1854. •

³ He married Susan Warren, a cousin of the Carseths, in 1815. He died at the age of ninety-two at Cliffe Cottage (Sunset), on the western bank of the Truro river, in the parish of Kea, on January 19, 1863. His nephew, then headmaster of Rugby, went to the funeral.

⁴ Dr. Warre writes that John James was in the Upper Division of the Fifth in July 1796, along with John Bird Sumner (Archbishop of Canterbury), Vice-Chancellor Shadwell, Charles Manners Sutton (Speaker of the House of Commons), and others.

traced back to a strong and good old North country stock.¹

We now return to the mother's side. The mother of the future Archbishop was a Miss Dorcas Carveth, a Cornish lady. The memoranda that follow give ample proof that she was a lady of unusually strong principles and sterling qualities, who exercised a very remarkable influence on all her children as long as she lived. She was born in July 1786, and died at the Schoolhouse, Rugby, at the age of seventy-nine, on May 8, in the year 1866. Her grave is in the Rugby cemetery, with the simple inscription, "I know that my Redeemer liveth."

The acquaintance between the Temples and the Carveths may have begun through the friendship of the Temple family with Sir Christopher Hawkins, Bart., M.P., of Trewithen, in the parish of Probus, who was Octavius' godfather. Probus is some distance from St. Gluvias, lying to the east of Truro. Sir Christopher Hawkins had the reputation of not being given to hospitality. Some lines stuck to the Trewithen gate have survived a century:—

Now tell me who lives here :
A large park and no deer :
A large cellar and no beer :
A large house and no cheer :
Christopher Hawkins does live here.

¹ In answer to an inquiry from his son William, the Archbishop writes, November 30, 1895: "Sir William Temple belonged to our branch of the Temple family. One is Irish, and the late Lord Palmerston was at the head of it. One (the oldest) is represented by the baronet, Sir Leofric Temple. And the third is the Stowe branch, of which the late Duke of Buckingham was the head, and to this we belong. There has been much inter-marrying between these Temples and the Grenvilles.

"Sir William was a very considerable man in his own day; but it was not a day of really great men. Cromwell was gone, and Marlborough had not yet come to the front."—Ed.

Richard Carveth, the father of Dorcas, himself the son of a Richard and a Dorcas (*née* Gerrans), owned and farmed Barteliver and Carvosso in the parish of Probus.¹

Mrs. James, whose family has resided in St. Clement's, near Truro, for almost 400 years, and who is an old friend of the Carveth family, and succeeded them in the occupation of Barteliver, writes :—

Richard Carveth had a splendid personality; often his sayings were quoted and his word was law. The Carveths were a fine old stock, of good descent. They can trace their pedigree through Le Despensers to Guy de Beauchamp, second Earl of Warwick. They had all the qualities of gentle birth; frank, honourable, and, I must say, loved to command; remarkable for their keen sense of honour. The Carveths were always true to Church and State; all dependents, as well as the family, were due in church on Sunday morning.

Mrs. James also remarks that “there was no smuggler's cave on the Carveth estate, and the Squire was not a patron of cock-fighting.”

The engagement of their daughter to Captain Temple was not welcomed by the parents. The young officer, bred in a different home atmosphere, who had been in the army since he was sixteen, must have seemed an incongruous addition to the strict and old-fashioned Cornish family. They had no love for the army; the war-taxes pressed landowners very severely, and the army was probably, for the moment, unpopular. Moreover, the Squire's sons were giving him anxiety, and Dorcas was still under twenty-one.² On these grounds it is stated that

¹ The property was sold after Major Temple's death. Some “Barteliver money” came to the daughters, Mrs. Temple and Mrs. Blackmore.

² One of Dorcas' elder brothers was a student under Dr. Abernethy. It was to him that Dr. Abernethy made the remark that “he must always keep two pockets, one for his patients' fees and another for their insults.”

Richard Carveth forbade the banns. "I will have no soldiers in my family" is the saying attributed to him. But the marriage took place, nevertheless, on July 8, 1805, Nicholas and Catherine Carveth¹ being the witnesses. Nicholas was an elder brother, born July 17, 1777. Catherine, born in 1787, was the younger sister of Dorcas; she afterwards married Mr. Blackmore, a doctor in St. Austell, and died in May 1852.

Mrs. James writes in March 1903 :—

Dorcas Carveth loved her old home extremely, and must have described it minutely. Dr. Temple, when first made Bishop of Exeter, came to visit us at Barteliver, and saw it then for the first time. He went round the house, and, touching a cupboard in the dining-room, said, "My mother never told me of this." On inquiry I found that it had been put up after she had left Barteliver. On his visit he gathered mosses and lichen from the old garden wall, and borrowed a tiny basket from my baby girl to pack them in. Eighteen years after, on her marriage to Fleet-Surgeon Charles James, R.N., the Bishop of London sent her a jewel pendant—how she values it!—with a letter now on my table, "I send a little token of regard to the first bride married from Barteliver since my mother was." Dr. Temple's heart was in Cornwall. He once wrote to me about "the two Cornish lads you ask after"—his own sons.

It is interesting to note, as an instance of Mrs. Temple's forethought, that in the margin of the Baptismal Register at Probus there is an entry of the birth on November 30, 1821, and of the baptism on December 8, 1822, of Frederick, son of Octavius and Dorcas Temple, at Santa Maura, with the signature of George Winnock, Chaplain to the Forces, as the clergyman who performed the ceremony; the curate of Probus testifying that this entry was a true copy of the certificate sent to

¹ The name, "Catherine Carveth," scratched on a window-pane in the house at Barteliver, may still be seen by visitors to this ancient Cornish house.

him.¹ This certificate had to be produced on several occasions in later life.

Richard Carveth died December 17, 1822, and his wife Margaret (formerly Andrew) died June 22, 1824, aged seventy-nine.

Dorcas is described as "petite"; but the Carveths were a tall race, distinguished for dark hair and eyes and a fair skin; peculiarities which perhaps gave rise to the tradition, or resulted from the fact, that they had Spanish blood in them since the time of the Armada.

It was from the blend of this sound, ancient, and religious Cornish family, with the more brilliant Temple stock from Berwick-on-Tweed, that Frederick Temple sprang.

¹ This was kindly communicated by the Rev. Canon Fox Harvey, Vicar of Probus.

CHAPTER II

LIFE IN THE IONIAN ISLANDS, 1821-1830

Memoranda by Miss Temple—Archbishop's Reminiscences.

FREDERICK TEMPLE, as we have seen, was born in the Ionian Islands. He was the thirteenth of fifteen children, of whom eight grew up.¹

Although he was taken to England at nine years old, his recollections of his early years were vivid, and the influences on him of his home education and surroundings were permanent. The chief authority for this part of his life is a paper of Memoranda, dictated by Miss Temple (Jennetta Octavia) to Archdeacon Wilson in 1888 at Cannes.

From this paper the following extract is taken, and gives a vivid account of the life in the Ionian Islands :—

My earliest recollection is the home party at Santa Maura. My father, mother, sister (Catherine, afterwards Mrs. Moberly), myself, and two brothers, Frederick and

¹ The names of those eight were :—

Anne Laura (Mrs. Thorold), born March 30, 1806, at Probus.

William Octavius, born April 14, 1809, at Bradford, Yorkshire.

Stow Margaret (Mrs. Hugo), born August 7, 1811.

Catherine (Mrs. Moberly), born August 6, 1812, at Malta.

Frank (drowned at sea), born April 8, 1814, at Kea.

Jennetta Octavia (Miss Temple), born 1819, baptized March 17, 1819, at Canterbury.

Frederick, born November 30, 1821, at Santa Maura.

John (Colonel Temple), born 1823, at Santa Maura.

Anne Laura and William Octavius married, and Frank died, before the family went to England in 1830.

John, formed the party. My father was the Resident, or Commandant, of Santa Maura. We lived in Government House, a house built after a great earthquake, and situated within the Castle precincts. It was one storey high, with the exception of one room. It was supported on pillars of wood.

At Santa Maura there was, next to our house, a large yard; in the yard there was a fowl-house. In this yard we three went to play, but Frederick very often would rather read his book (though he could not possibly have been more than five years old) than play; and it is marked in my recollection by our having a great hunt for him, and finding him perched up in the fowl-house with his book.

My mother was considered a beautiful woman, with gentle manners, knowing no language but her own, not clever in the sense of brilliant at all, but thoughtful, with excellent judgment, great sense of personal dignity, governing her family without any effort, without severity. Her word was an unquestioned law. Her children were obedient, without feeling the possibility of being otherwise. In the usual daily life and in sickness, tender and loving; but if her children did wrong, regarding them with surprised anger at the possibility of doing it; so that while grave faults would be confessed to my father, they would not be confessed to her—from no fear of punishment, but from fear of the look of horror in her eyes. She was the only teacher that myself and my brothers had until they went to school. She taught us to read and write; she taught arithmetic, with very little knowledge of arithmetic herself, by steady repetition. She had a key to the sums in the arithmetic book, giving the answers. If a sum was brought to her and the answer was wrong, she drew her pencil through it and made no further remark. It had to be done again till it was done right. The sum of to-day was repeated to-morrow, and so on, until perfect accuracy was obtained.

When it was time for my brothers to begin Latin the same system was adopted. She could not pronounce it, but Frederick had to learn a few lines each day, always repeating the old until seven or ten pages had been learnt. Then the first four or five pages would be left, and a further advance made. This went on day by day and year by year until he was twelve years old; and he went to school knowing his grammar perfectly, as no other boy knew it. He was unable to pronounce it, and was therefore put to the bottom of the

school; but he soon picked up the pronunciation and rose rapidly. Euclid was the same. She did not understand a word. He began to do so as he advanced in the subject, and could substitute one expression for another, or change the order of letters. She interposed and corrected him. He would reply impatiently "It was all the same." "Say it," she ordered, "precisely as it is here," touching the book.¹

Algebra he learned by himself, but I do not know how far he understood it. It was learned in the same accurate way, repeating each portion of the book. My mother was a very religious woman, but very reticent. At Santa Maura and at Corfu there was no chaplain and no regular service.² But my mother, from the earliest time I can remember, read, every day, the Psalms and Lessons with her children; but she never made any comment; so much so that when we read through the Gospels, one after the other, I thought the Jews had crucified Christ *again*, and I remember crying at the thought that they had done it again. The Catechism was taught in the same way, systematically, but not a word was said about it. I cannot remember my father taking any part in it. But one saying of his remains in my memory: "I don't *care* about the miracles."

My mother's sister was a Methodist, and used to ask her when she was converted. She replied, "I don't know what you mean; I have tried to please God all the days of my life."³

Another part of our education was this: we were taught not to have fear. When the earthquake came at Santa

¹ Mr. H. Lee Warner writes that recently, when he was staying at Lambeth, the Archbishop told him that on his ninth birthday, to the best of his recollection, after he had gone to bed, his mother happened incidentally to mention to his father that she had carried out his orders to teach the boy Euclid, and that he knew his Euclid. "What! all of it? Can he say any proposition?" "Yes, he knows it all." The father, naturally disbelieving this, had the child woke up, when he repeated, sitting up in bed, a long proposition.

² The chaplain had probably to visit many stations.

³ Miss C. F. Lawson writes on April 15, 1903, after reading the draft of this chapter in MS.: "I should like, from personal knowledge, to testify to the justice of Miss Temple's estimate of her mother's character. Gentle, yet with good ability to rule well and firmly, and most truly excellent, she never failed to gain the respect of all those who came in contact with her. In my happy visits to Axon as a young girl, I felt she was unlike any one I had ever known; and thought how easy it would be to be good, if one lived there under the influence of herself and her daughter."

Maura and threw the plaster into the middle of the room, my distinct recollection is that there was no idea of fear. The life was to go on.

The boys were under an absolute rule of courtesy. No personal remarks on their sisters or others were tolerated. They were taught that courtesy was to be ever maintained in the family. We were not at all rich, and lived very plainly. Butter was expensive, and we lived on dry bread, except that now and then we were allowed some jam or—a rarer treat still—some dripping. This lasted when we were in England; one exception was made for me, because I was delicate. I was allowed, without remark, to take dry bread instead of anything else that was offered me. The boys were to eat whatever was given them.

To these recollections of Miss Temple may be added a few memories of the Archbishop's own conversation. On April 16, 1901, the Rev. W. J. Conybeare, Domestic Chaplain to the Archbishop, wrote to his father from Lambeth Palace :—

For four hours to-day I have found myself alone with the Archbishop. He is most kind, and talked a great deal. He told me about his early life, which is most interesting: "My earliest recollection is the great earthquake of 1825, when I was four. First the house went up and down like a wave. The chimney fell through the roof, past the foot of the bed where my mother was ill in bed, through the floor on to a table where my brother was writing. Then the house went on one side, and the roof slipped off into the street. Down came a torrent of rain, and our nursery was three inches deep in water. There were fifteen of us, and I was the thirteenth. My six-year-old birthday was a far more terrible day than the earthquake. My mother expected us all on our sixth birthday to say the Catechism without a mistake. I succeeded, and got what was then a large sum of money—sixpence."

He was taught for twelve years by his mother. By the time he was six he could do any arithmetic. Before he went to school he knew twelve¹ books of Euclid, and the Latin Grammar, and could speak English, Italian, and modern

¹ This is probably an error. See note 2, p. 31.

Greek fluently.¹ His mother's great principle was never to forget the beginnings. Thus in arithmetic, simple addition, etc., would be done daily along with harder sums.

He had special difficulty in reading and spelling. If ever he attempted to argue that certain letters did not spell a certain word, his mother would say, "Freddy, don't argue; do your work."

Being in foreign parts, there was a "great scarcity of books. When he was seven he had read Duncan's *Cæsar*, Dryden's *Virgil*, Pope's *Homer*, *Evenings at Home*, and become well-informed by means of Watkin's *Encyclopædia*. When his mother was sending home for some books he asked specially for *Robinson Crusoe*. Instead, they sent the *Swiss Family Robinson*—"a hateful book, the liars were always so lucky."

On his eighty-first birthday, St. Andrew's Day, 1902, after he had for the last time celebrated the Holy Communion, in the chapel of the Old Palace at Canterbury, he spoke of some of his early memories.

The Archbishop said that as a child he had been very much puzzled by the words of the marriage service—"With my body I thee worship." He went to his mother and asked, "How can one worship with one's body?" His mother explained that worship was not used here in the usual spiritual sense, but meant that the husband would do such things for his wife as opening the door for her, fetching her a chair, etc. The little boy secretly made up his mind to watch his father, to see whether he performed these little services for his wife. "But it was no use," added the Archbishop, "for he always did."

¹ To the last^o he retained his affection for modern Greek. In December 1901, about the time of the riots in Athens, caused by the royal proposal to translate the New Testament into modern Greek, when asked what was his opinion on the question, he replied that he should strongly favour the proposed translation. "Modern Greek," he said, "is no mere patois, but a fine language, differing so far from ancient Greek that the people would understand a translation better than the original. We find him also reading Italian at Oxford.

These recollections are sufficient to bring before us the "atmosphere" and influences which surrounded the first nine years of his childhood. A sunny, warm climate, lending itself to an open-air, wholesome life; a large family of children, in a household of rigid economy and strict discipline; the children thrown much on their own resources for occupation, mixing so freely with servants or others as to acquire, without labour, some fluency in Italian¹ and modern Greek, and a mother of very unusual force and firmness of character and deep piety; who, like the mother of the Wesleys, taught the children everything, while she attended to all household matters.

But to these we must add two other influences which might be overlooked.

One was that of the father, a man of great ability, uprightness, and force of character, as has been already seen, though he was much occupied with military and official business.

It is plain from their recollections of the father whom they lost so early, and with whom they were very intimate during the years at Axon, that a very warm affection and confidence mingled with the fear inspired by a temper often irritated by trifles. The Archbishop spoke little of his father, but always with great love and respect. One story is worth recording. The boy had made some inaccurate statement; and when corrected said, rather lightly, "It will be all the same a hundred years hence." He recalled the tremendous earnestness with which his father turned on him and said, "That might be true of some things, but was never true of a lie; it poisoned the very air."

The other was that of the two elder sisters, Catherine and Jennetta. Of the unfailing judgment

¹ When at school he wrote letters to his sisters in Italian. Editor's Supplement, vol. ii. p. 402.—ED.

and worth of the former, Mrs. Moberly,—all who knew Dr. Temple in later years will remember his high estimate,—and the influence on him of a sister like Jennetta, only two years his senior, with an intelligence and force of character equal to his own, an instinct for justice and kindness to which thousands could testify, and an affectionate devotion to him which never wavered, this was one of the formative influences of life which began in this Ionian home.

But perhaps the most noticeable and the most important point is the intensely English and religious atmosphere of this military home in a foreign country. The home seems quite unaffected by the accident that it was not in England. The religion of the mother was eminently practical, unspeculative, unquestioning. So strong was this influence on the children that the superstitions of nurses and servants and other foreign modes of thought among which they were brought up made no impression upon them. The mother was the supreme authority.

It has been said that the Archbishop had the singular misfortune to be born out of his native county. But in truth his mother took Cornwall with her to the Ionian Islands, and it was in a Cornish home that the child grew up to boyhood.

CHAPTER III

LIFE AT AXON, 1830-1833

Reminiscences by Miss Temple and the Archbishop—Major Temple, Governor of Sierra Leone—The Rev. J. Richey—The Rev. J. Blackmore.

MAJOR TEMPLE went on half-pay, unattached, in February 1827, and was allowed to dispose of his commission on June 3, 1828. He shortly afterwards resigned his colonial appointment and went to England. This was in the year 1830.

Miss Temple's memoranda may here be resumed. She, it will be remembered, was then about eleven and the boys about nine and seven, respectively. The elder sister, Catherine, afterwards Mrs. Moberly, was about eighteen. A younger brother or sister appears to have died before they came to England.

We went in a little vessel round by Gibraltar, where the boys went ashore. The first English land I saw was Lundy. Then we went to Milford Haven, but did not land; and went on to Bristol, and landed there. We took a post-chaise and drove through Bristol to Bideford. My mother, who had left England early in her married life, and remembered it with the utmost love, had often told us of the charms and beauties of England, its fruits, its people. I cried as we drove through Bristol; and when I was asked the reason, I said it was because the people were so ugly. At Bideford my father set to work to realise his vision of delight. He bought a farm, Axon, near Culmstock, in Devon, intending to make money enough by it to educate

his sons.¹ But it was bad land,⁴ and he was no farmer, and he began to see it was impossible. Thus life began there. My father's feeling about his children was that they must work for their bodily good, and share the life of the people. So Catherine and I had to help the women-servants and share their life. The boys picked stones into heaps,² took out weeds, docks, and thistles, and laid the roots in heaps, and were paid for their work like any labourer.

After some time of trial my father found that the farm would not pay, and he therefore applied to Government for employment, and was offered the governorship of Sierra Leone; and after great reluctance on the part of my mother, let the farm, not the house, in which she remained—and my eldest sister Catherine went with him to Sierra Leone. As soon as he thought that he had saved sufficient money he desired my mother to send Frederick to school, to Blundell's School, Tiverton. The headmaster at that time was Dr. Dicken. My father died before he had been two years³ in Sierra Leone; and my sister returned to England.

The Government granted my mother a pension of £100 a year for her life; but she found that she could not afford to send the boys to a boarding-school. Dr. Dicken offered to take Frederick free, but she declined this; the master of the Lower School, Mr. Boulton, also invited the other brother, John, but she declined this also.

During these three years then, between the ages of nine and twelve, Frederick was living at Axon, having no other instruction than that which his mother could give him. The nature of that instruction has been described in the previous chapter, and it must have continued during these years. But in accordance with his father's theory of what was for the physical and moral good of the little boy, only two hours a day were given to lessons. Most of the day was spent out of doors in farm labour, as above described,

¹ The Archbishop sold this property in 1895; but he subsequently subscribed liberally to the restoration of the schools and to other parish institutions. He also restored, and is believed to have given, the east window of the south aisle of the church.

² On land reclaimed from the downs, in front of the house.

³ Really in eight months. Permission to examine the Colonial Office records of this period has been refused.

and in going messages.¹ * During his holidays, when at Blundell's, perhaps even later, he continued to share in this bodily labour, from the pure love of labour, for at this time they had no farm. At Axon he laid the foundation of the vigorous health and strong frame which endured the constant strain of labour during a long life. There, too, he learnt to love Devon men and Devon scenery with all his heart.

It was at this period of his life that the incident of the bag of nails occurred, which has been told with various details. Some repairs in farm buildings were going on, and the workmen wanted some large nails. Mrs. Temple told them to put down on paper what they wanted, and then despatched the boy with money to pay for the nails. Miss Temple's recollection of it was as follows :—

My mother wanted some nails ; she told Frederick that he was to walk to Wellington, five miles off ; she gave him a bag and some money. She had not the least idea of the price of nails ; but he thought he was to bring back as many nails as his money would pay for. Time went on ; he was expected home. My mother began to walk anxiously about, looking up the road, hour after hour. At last was seen the little boy with his bag of nails, so heavy that he could not carry it ; he could only just give it a little swing along the road. And when she saw what she had done she burst into tears, very unusual for her, and petted and comforted her poor little exhausted boy.

These memoranda of Miss Temple may well be supplemented, as regards her brother's boyhood at

¹ The Rev. D. Purnell-Edwards, who as a boy often stayed with the family at Axon, writes : "The house called Axon was, as regards outward appearance, very plain, but sufficiently commodious and very comfortable within. It stood in what appeared a very lonely spot, certainly with no other house of its size and kind within reasonable distance. There was, however, a considerable hamlet, occupied by very poor people, about a quarter of a mile off, which, being a considerable distance from the parish church, came naturally under the charge of the Misses Temple, who ministered to their wants, spiritual as well as temporal." Some old people still living there remember "Master Frederick" teaching them in Sunday School. . . .

Axon, by an extract from his address to working-men at the Nottingham Church Congress in 1897:—

When I was a little boy I knew very much more about working-men of that sort (who work mainly with their bodies) than about any other working-men whatever. My father was a working-man—he was a soldier—he served his country in various parts, and he died a Governor of one of Her Majesty's colonies. I was not very old at his death. He died when I was thirteen, and the result of his death was that from the early age of seventeen I have made my own living. Though I had had an excellent education, and though I put my brains to the utmost stretch of their power to do what was before me in life, I had experience, nevertheless, of a great deal of privation in the course of that time. I knew what it was, for instance, to be unable to afford a fire, and consequently to be very cold, days and nights. I knew what it was every now and then to live upon rather poor fare. I knew what it was—and I think that was the thing that pinched me most—to wear patched clothes and patched shoes. When I mention these things I do so simply in order to make you understand how heartily my sympathies go along with working-men. Nor did I ever experience what the work of a working-man of that class is. I believe that at this moment there is probably not another man in England who would thresh better than I could. Threshing has gone out of fashion. It is all done by machinery now, and there are very few people who learn to thresh. I learned to plough, and I could plough as straight a furrow as any man in the parish. My heart goes along with the men who have had this put before them in the course of their lives.

Two other characteristic incidents of this period may be related in his own words. He made a speech at the London Diocesan Conference in April 1892, from which the following is an extract:—

The President, Dr. Temple, thought a great deal might be done by preaching on the subject of family prayers. He could remember, as a little boy, the effect of such a sermon. His father having been in a marching regiment, their family habits were rather unsettled; but when they had settled down in a Devonshire village the clergyman on one occasion preached a sermon on this subject, and strongly urged the

use of family prayers. In his own family that very evening the practice was commenced, and of course continued, in consequence of that sermon.

There was often a greater effect produced by sermons than was generally supposed, for they did not see the source from which the practice had come, but it had come as the result of the sermon.¹

In 1896 there was a discussion in Convocation on secondary education ; and the Bishop of London made some remarks on the present relations of the parochial clergy to the parents of secondary school pupils :—

The Bishop of London (Dr. Temple) moved Resolution No. 6.

I am afraid that there is not such pastoral visiting of those classes who send their children to a secondary school as there used to be. I do not mean that it was universal in those days, but it seems to me that fifty years ago it was much more common, and because it was more common, it was more effective.

I can remember what an impression was made upon me when I was a little boy. I did not come to England till I was nine years old, and then I went to live in a village in Devonshire.

I can remember the impression, and it has never left me since—which was made upon me and the rest of our household by the first call that was made at our house by the clergyman of the parish ; and yet both to my mother and to my father this seemed the most natural thing in the world. The clergyman came to our house to make a call, and after he had sat in the drawing-room for a little while, he said that it was his usual practice, in going round his parish, to endeavour, if he could, to have something like a short service, and he asked whether my mother would object to the servants being called in ; and he read us a small part of the New Testament, not very many verses, and he talked about it for a little while, and then he ended with prayers taken from the Prayer-book, mostly from the collects, and then he bade us good-bye and went on to another house.

This sort of visit came round every half-year, quite as

¹ *Guardian*, May 4, 1892.


regularly as everything else in the working of his parish, and I know that at that time this was not an uncommon thing to do. Every house in the parish was visited in this way, unless the householder declined to admit the clergyman for any such purpose.¹

Such were some of the influences on the boy at this period; a country home of rigid and necessary economy, and of sturdy independence; a life of open air or domestic labour, in which all bore their willing part under a father enthusiastic for the improvement of the farm; of careful and strict religious observance; of teaching at the hands of a mother who insisted on obedience and on absolute accuracy in every detail, and of a father who was the very soul of honour, and who, as his daughter records,² “burnt with indignation at the state of the poor”; and to this must be added the religious influence of the clergyman of the village. We have seen what this was in two instances; Dr. Temple never spoke of him without deep respect. It is possible that his interest in temperance and home mission work began in those days, for the Vicar of Culmstock was very active among the railway navvies then at work in his neighbourhood.

The Rev. J. Richey, then the curate in charge, and an excellent and godly man, was one of those who contributed to the building up of the great Archbishop. He was soon succeeded by the Rev. John Blackmore, a fine West Country parson, for whom also the Archbishop had a great respect.

¹ *Guardian*, July 15, 1896.

² P. 6.



MCNEILL'S SCHOOL, TIVERTON.

CHAPTER IV

LIFE AT BLUNDELL'S SCHOOL, TIVERTON, 1834-1839

Entry at School—Confirmation—Recollections—Scholarship.

FROM the Entry Register of Blundell's School, we learn that Frederick Temple, son of Major Octavius Temple (Governor of Sierra Leone), Culmstock, aged twelve, was entered on January 29, 1834,¹ and left March 25, 1839. With one exception he was the last boy who entered under Dr. Dicken,² who left in June of 1834.

At that time, in the Upper and Lower Schools together, the number of boys was 133.

In the following year his brother, "John Temple, son of Mrs. Temple, Axon, Wellington, aged twelve," was entered August 15, and he left March 25, 1839. The two boys and Richard Blackmore, son of the Vicar of Culmstock, afterwards the author of *Lorna Doone*, went into lodgings in Cops Court and lived there very economically. The fees

¹ On January 30, he writes, "When I was asked by Dr. Dicken what I had learnt I soon convinced him that I understood the Latin grammar. He then asked me to demonstrate a proposition of Euclid; and when I had done it, he said he wished that all the boys in the school knew as much about it as I did."

² The Rev. G. H. Statham, Prebendary of Exeter Cathedral, has supplied the following memorandum: "My father-in-law, Dr. Dicken, told me that he had met (Archbishop) Temple's father, then, I believe, Major Temple, in Italy: that they had shared a post-chaise, travelled together, and became great friends; that on their parting Major Temple said, 'When I return to England I shall settle in Devonshire, and send my boy to your school.'"—ED.

for town boys at that time are said to have been "about £4 a year."

The materials for this chapter of the Archbishop's life are somewhat more copious than those for the two earlier chapters, because he often revisited Blundell's, and spoke much of his school-days; many of his letters also have been kept. But consideration of space, and of the relative importance of events in his life, will limit this narrative to those incidents and memories which seem to throw light on his growth in character.

The boys were placed by Mr. Sanders under the special charge of Edward Pearce, of Somer Leigh, Dorset, one of the senior boys, whose mother was well known to Major Temple in his early days. Mr. Pearce congratulated him twenty-two years afterwards on his appointment to Rugby, and received a very warm letter of thanks for this and "all your kindness to me at Blundell's,"—he had given him the run of his study.

It was at the very beginning of his school-life that he was confirmed, when he was only twelve years old; and the recollections of his own confirmation were always present to his mind when discussions arose as to the suitable age for confirmation. It depended, he used to say, on the boy himself, and in particular on his understanding the nature of a promise.

Mrs. Conybeare writes a recollection of what the Archbishop said on this subject in 1902:—

I was sent to Blundell's School at Tiverton, and was confirmed while there. The clergyman of the place did not pay much attention to those under his preparation; all he did was to bring us together in one room and make us say the Catechism all round. My mother considered this preparation insufficient, and she arranged that for several weeks before the day of my confirmation, I should go home each Saturday when we had a holiday, a journey of about eight miles by coach, in order to be prepared by her. I reached

home about noon, and every week found carefully prepared questions written out by my mother, ready for me to answer on paper. My afternoon was spent on these answers, and I returned the same evening to Tiverton. No one, I believe, was ever better prepared for confirmation than I was by my mother. I was under thirteen years of age when I was confirmed. Without delay¹ I became a communicant, and have continued so ever since. Throughout my Oxford days this was my greatest safeguard.

In April 1870 a banquet was given in Blundell's School to him as Bishop of Exeter. In reply to the toast of the "Bishop and Clergy," he said :—

This school, from my earliest childhood, has been the object of my warmest affections, because I was never at any other before, or after I left it. I came here taught by my mother, and having known no other teacher, with no other supply of knowledge than an acquaintance with the Latin grammar, though unable to construe a Latin sentence, and a slight knowledge of the books of Euclid and of Bonycastle's Arithmetic.² From this school I began to learn everything else I wanted for carrying me through life. I was here five years and a quarter, and I shall never forget the friends I became endeared to during that time. I found here a master³ whose kindness has never ceased from that day to this, and to whose house I know I am always welcome. I found here most careful instruction, such as made me, when I went to college, what I became there ; and ever since, when I look back upon those days, my heart has leaped with pleasure.

¹ This must refer to his practice at home. On March 5, 1836, he writes to his mother : " One of the boys in my class is going to take the Sacrament on Easter Day, if he can get Mr. Sanders's leave, and he has asked me to get Mr. Sanders's leave to go with him. I do not like to go without your permission, since it is by no means a customary thing here at school." His early devotional interests are shown in his letter ; e.g., March 19, 1837, he writes : " You promised to send me your Bible that has references in it : will you please to send it next Tuesday : and, if I may have it, *Nelson's* 'Fasts and Festivals' with it."

² On September 8, 1835, he writes : " I do not think Mr. Mills a very good mathematician ; I proposed doing the eleventh and twelfth books after I had done the rest, but to my astonishment I found that he knew very little about them."

³ Mr. Sanders, afterwards Archdeacon of Exeter.

It was always in this tone of affection and gratitude that he spoke of his old school as a place of "happinesses which have never returned," and of his old headmaster as "one who had a wonderful gift of reading one's very soul."

On the same occasion, in a speech later in the afternoon, in replying to a toast proposed by the Earl of Devon, he entered more into detail :—

I came here when I was twelve years old, being placed at the bottom¹ of the school with boys of seven or thereabouts. I felt exceedingly ashamed of being so low in the school, and made every exertion to rise higher, until I was promoted to the monitor class, the highest place in the school. On one occasion when I did not get a prize, and complained of having to contend against others who had been in the class a considerably longer time than I had, Mr. Sanders looked at me curiously, and said, "You are a greedy boy, and had better go to your place." I stayed in the monitors' class for nearly two and a half years. When I came here football was at its height, and on the second day I was drawn for a match, and told by a big boy to stand at the goal and not let the ball pass. Soon afterwards the ball came that way, and I rushed towards it, but before I could think of the consequences, I was kicked with the ball right through the goal. After that day I was looked upon as a courageous football player, and to this time I have on my shins the marks of kicks received in that game. I can assure you that while the Earl of Devon has been so kind as to speak of the exertions I made in my studies, I exerted myself just as hard at football and cricket.

Other recollections were given by the Archbishop in his last visit to Blundell's in October 1900. He visited the spot where fights came off—the "ironing-box," a triangular patch of grass—

¹ In the summer of 1834 Mr. A. Boulton, master of the Lower School, writes to Mr. Sanders: "The usual time for a boy going through the Lower School is from two years to two and a half years; none have been less. Temple is the only instance of a boy going through in one half-year." This letter was forwarded to Major Temple.

In February 1834 Frederick writes to his mother: "There are seven classes in the Lower School, and I am in the fifth."

and told the tale of his first fight, in which he was victorious. "But I was not always successful on this spot," he added, after a pause. His letters home show that there was a good deal of fighting and swearing, and occasional drinking among the boys.¹

It is the recollection of a contemporary, Mr. Tom Clarke, that if Dr. Dicken "happened" to pass when a fight was going on, he always "happened" to be looking in another direction.

We get the impression of a thorough schoolboy, a delightful companion, most loyal to his school, absolutely trustworthy in all great matters, but not above, or shall we say below, getting into small scrapes. On one occasion the headmaster said to him, "Temple, I do believe you are the most impudent boy that ever lived. I really must teach you to restrain your spirits."

To his absolute trustworthiness as a boy there are many testimonies. Miss Lawson, the sister of his oldest and dearest friend, now (April 1903) in her eighty-third year, writes:—

As a boy of fourteen he was living in small lodgings with a young brother under his care, who also attended Blundell's School; and the headmaster accidentally found that if prevented from attending church the two boys always read the whole service together, owing to a promise they had made to their mother.

Between the Archbishop and my late brother (she continues) there was unbroken friendship, extending over many years. At school he and his brother spent each Sunday evening and the Thursday half-holiday at our house in Tiverton. We young people were all on brotherly and sisterly terms, but we could not help looking up to him; for his ability and conscientiousness made us feel that what

¹ On February 12, 1834, the little boy writes: "The boys like me very much in the school, but not so much out of it. They swear so much that I can hardly bear it; and they not only do it themselves, but they take away my things and then say I shall not have them again unless I swear, which of course I will not do."

"Frederick" said and did must be right. Yet he was always pleasant, ready to join in any fun, and so kind and gentle to those weaker than himself that it was no wonder that we loved him.

The friend and brother here spoken of was the Rev. Robert Lawson, Rector of Upton-on-Severn, Honorary Canon of Worcester, whose intimate friendship with the Archbishop began in 1833, and lasted till his death in the autumn of 1897. Canon Lawson used to say of him that he never knew any boy so entirely conscientious "out of sight," or more inflexible in keeping promises and doing his duties.

In an attempt to estimate the intellectual forces that influenced him during these school years, in addition to the sound school teaching, the desire to please his mother, and the stimulus of such school friends as Robert Lawson and others, must be placed very high the large freedom, both in school-time and holidays, to follow his own course of reading. The range of school studies was small, far smaller than it is now; the quantity of work was perhaps less; the pressure of examinations less; the demands on monitors for school organisation and discipline and games far less; life at school was more leisurely, and therefore better adapted to the self-development of boys of first-rate ability. It was not the result of lessons done in school only that he became so widely read a scholar in those last years at school.

In the speech delivered in 1870, from which an extract has been already given, he added some words which are very opportune at the present time:—

We were, when I was here, taught to rely upon our own exertions, and were well tested. We were not made merely to listen to a teacher, but to learn. I have sometimes thought that we might have been taught to learn a little more than we did, and have wished that the course had

been a little wider than it was; yet I have never been able to get rid of the feeling that if you have few lessons, and a great deal of time, to those who, like myself, took a great interest in the work, you found an incentive in the freedom in which you were left. I know I read nearly the whole of Euripides in my spare time out of school; and I don't think I should have done so much if I had been given the same amount of work in school-lessons. You may depend upon it, there is a real and special value in this throwing a boy on his own resources, and allowing him to learn in such a way as this. I can remember that I got hold of a book—no doubt known to most of you—Bland's *Algebraical Problems*, and worked entirely through it in my play-time, and found afterwards that it gave me a mastery of the lower parts of algebra which I doubt if I could have obtained from any teacher whatever. I must confess, therefore, that I have a love for the old Grammar School system.

Dr. Temple's colleagues at Rugby will remember how much importance he attached to giving boys opportunity to do—and also freedom to forbear from doing—independent work. He felt that an estimate of the ability and promise of boys, based solely on their power of absorbing and reproducing what they were taught, was a very imperfect and incorrect estimate; it was of far more importance in estimating promise, as well as in educating self-reliance and originality, and the faculty for study, to give boys large freedom to study, or to neglect to study, outside their school lessons.¹

¹ The school mark-book of 1838-39 has been kindly lent by Mr. A. L. Francis, the present headmaster (1903) of Blundell's School, and gives an interesting glimpse at the nature of the school work. The books read in the highest form in the quarter that began March 28, 1838, were Herodotus viii. 133-44, and ix. 1-85. Eurip. *Alcestis*; Cic. *Or. in Cat.* i.-iv.; and Lucret. i.-iii. The prize, a medal, for the three best compositions in that term was won by Lawson, Temple being second. Holiday tasks were very real. Christmas 1838, the head form had to write a Greek ode on "Herculis laudes," 15 to 18 stanzas; and Latin hexameters on Columbus, 60-70 lines. Next Christmas it was *εὐχολαίαι τυχόν* for a Greek ode, 16 to 18 stanzas; and "In nuptias Vict. Reg.," Latin ode, Alcaic. This was varied sometimes by English verse and Latin prose. The record of the winning the Balliol is very simple: Turner, Exhibition; Elton; Sidney Sussex; Temple, Balliol.

The great event in his school-life was the winning of a Blundell's Scholarship to Balliol College, Oxford. Scholarships at Wadham College, Oxford, and at Cambridge were much discussed.¹

At that time any one who wished to be a candidate for an exhibition or scholarship at the school had, if his father were not residing within the limits of the borough, to obtain the consent of ten of the householders; these consents he personally obtained, and was admitted to the examination. But after the examination the scholarships were awarded by the votes of the governors. On this occasion, for the scholarship tenable from Blundell's at Balliol, there were two competitors; and it appears that canvassing for votes among the governors was very active. It is within the recollection of the late Rev. Donald M. Owen, who was several years junior to Temple, and followed him as scholar and fellow of Balliol, that his father, who knew Temple well and saw his great ability, strenuously canvassed all the governors as they arrived for the meeting. Among them was Sir Thomas Acland, Bart., and the voting must have been very even; for, years afterwards, Sir Thomas told Chancellor Edmonds: "It was my vote, sir, as a governor of Blundell's, that sent Temple to Oxford."

But more than a scholarship was necessary; a £50 note was sent anonymously, and its donor was never revealed. It was surmised, but no more, that Sir Thomas sent it. It would have been very like him to do so. In after years some one asked the Archbishop about this, and inquired whether he had ever tried to find out who it was that had so

¹ He writes (no date): "The Scholarship at Wadham is limited to natives of Great Britain. Of course I cannot try; Balliol now is the only thing I can look to. This makes me feel a still greater preference for Cambridge, as there almost everything is open. But if I can get to Balliol, of course that would be the best."

helped him : "Of course I did not," was the reply ; "he asked me not."

This was in the summer of 1838, shortly before he was seventeen. But he did not go into residence till the following Easter. When he came up for matriculation, it appears that he had forgotten to bring with him the certificate that he had really won the scholarship. The Master, Dr. Jenkyns, as the Archbishop used to remember with a smile, said to him : "I am afraid, Mr. Temple, that I shall find a very careless young man among my undergraduates at Balliol, when you begin in this careless sort of way." However, the certificate was sent by post by the thoughtful headmaster, and the difficulty was got over.

These recollections are perhaps sufficient to show how fully the promise of the child was fulfilled in the boy. His extraordinary diligence and ability, which, in spite of very unskilled early teaching, enabled him to rise in three years from the very bottom of the school to the class of monitors, and then to win the scholarship to Balliol when only sixteen and a half years old ; his physical vigour, which seemed capable of bearing any fatigue, his joyous spirits, his capacity for friendships, and his absolute fidelity to duty, drew the attention of all who watched him. Mr. Sanders's parting words to him were : "Remember, Temple, when you are a Bishop, I shall expect you to give me a living." Mr. Sanders had a living given to him by some one else ; but Dr. Temple, as Bishop of Exeter, made Mr. Sanders Archdeacon of Exeter.

Mrs. Lawson, the widow of his old friend, writes that—

On the day when Temple won the Balliol scholarship he was walking back to his home at Axon, and was overtaken by one of the trustees, a country gentleman in the neighbourhood, who said : "Temple, I cannot say what you

are going to be, but this I am sure of, that if you live long enough, you will be one of the greatest men in England." He told us this many years later, saying that we were the first to whom he had mentioned this prediction; and he added: "How I walked on air as I went home! and now that success has come I do not care for it."

But he cared for it then; and in the spring of 1839 took his place as the youngest and most joyous of the scholars of Balliol.

His feeling towards his old school is well shown by the following note he wrote to the present headmaster, Mr. A. L. Francis, at the time of the Queen's Jubilee:—

FULHAM PALACE, S.W.,
June 16, 1887.

MY DEAR HEADMASTER—I write in every capacity that can be assigned to me to get a favour from you. I want a holiday for the boys on the 21st.

I entreat you as an old Blundellian, as a Blundell Scholar of Balliol, as a Blundell Fellow of Balliol, as a Governor of the School: surely the combined petitions of so many, all of them Blundellians, ought to prevail. Do!—Your humblest servant,
F. LONDON.

CHAPTER V

LIFE AS AN UNDERGRADUATE, 1839-1842

Society of Balliol—Dr. Jowett's memoranda—Professor J. C. Shairp's poem—Letter of Dr. Scott—Miss Temple's reminiscences—Personal expenditure—Oxford Movement. W. G. Ward. Arthur Clough. Temple's attitude—Appendix. Mathematical and scientific powers of Temple.

It was on April 9, 1839, that F. Temple went into residence at Balliol. The external events of his life as an undergraduate may be summed up in a single sentence. He was a most diligent student in classics and mathematics.¹ He won the "Powell" prize in his first year.² He was *proxime accessit*, taking the second place, for the Ireland

¹ He writes to his mother on April 24, 1839: "I begin work at five o'clock, and work till three, which includes also being in chapel, breakfast, and lectures. I then go out till dinner-time, which is at four, and after dinner till chapel time, which is at half-past five. After the chapel service is over I walk about in the garden, or get anything I want in the town till about 7 or 6.30, and then go to work again till I go to bed. At that time I do my easy work, and anything which does not require much attention, as I do not like to work very hard in the evening."

On October 19 he writes: "I awake very regularly at half-past four, and get up immediately and set to work; and by the time breakfast comes at half-past eight I am regularly hungry."

On October 1, 1841, he writes: "I have been in bed about half-past ten every night for the last week and more, and gone to sleep immediately, and up and dressed by four the next morning, sometimes by three, without any fatigue, and without even an alarum to awake me."

² He devoted the whole proceeds, £7, of this prize to buying books for his young brother, John, then sailing for India, and wrote in them the inscription: "Johaanni Temple, fratri amantissimo et carissimo, hunc librum, pecunia ob meritum in Academiae certamine data emptum, Fredericus Temple d.d."

Scholarship in March 1842.¹ He obtained a double-first in May 1842, and was appointed lecturer in mathematics and logic in the autumn of the same year.

It is evident from his letters to his mother and sister that in his intellectual and spiritual history these years were most stimulating and most formative. In them the vigorous and eager home-boy and schoolboy of seventeen grew into the man of twenty-one, conspicuous even in those days at Oxford for knowledge, ability, and force of character. Probably in no other period of his life was his growth at once so rapid and so solid. The stir and movement of the time, without apparently exciting him as it did many of his friends and contemporaries, called out all his powers. His keen political interests show themselves constantly in his letters. He came up to Oxford steeped in conservative traditions and feelings. He told the story how his form master at Blundell's once asked each boy in turn "Whig or Tory?" and then sent all the Whigs to the bottom. He thus suddenly was placed at the top of his form, and stayed there.

As an undergraduate he was an ardent Tory. The "Decade" was a very select debating society of distinguished young scholars; and he writes on one occasion "Coleridge and I were the only Tories present." He writes to his mother and sisters about India, Mehemet Ali, Louis Philippe, and M. Guizot, and about the proposed abdication

¹ On March 3, 1842, he writes: "I have not got the Ireland, but I am second, and the examiners tell me I was very near. It is a very good thing to have this public mention, as it will ensure my having pupils. My tutor for scholarship is rather disappointed. The other tutors are quite astounded; and each of them tells me (I cannot resist telling you) that he had always thought I devoted myself exclusively to what I was doing with him; while my mathematical master expressed his wonder, almost as if he could not have dreamt of a man who had done so much mathematics being willing to waste time on such stuff as classical scholarship. Now please not to think me very conceited. The name of the successful candidate is Jones of Trinity."

of the Emperor of Austria, as matters of great and immediate interest.¹ The study of no other period of his life will throw more light on his real personality, or give a truer perspective of his whole life as a unity. It would be superfluous in these memoirs to attempt to give any picture of the Oxford society of those years. That picture has been drawn by master-hands in the letters and narratives, or in the biographies, of some of his illustrious contemporaries whom he outlived. But the letters, which are printed in this and the following chapters, help us to recall at least the names of some of those who made that epoch of Balliol and Oxford intellectually famous, and with whom Temple would be brought into relation.

The society into which the young Blundell Scholar was suddenly plunged was not only brilliant intellectually, but it was at once disturbed and stimulated by a religious and theological movement which has no parallel. From Oxford the movement which had begun in 1833 was now vibrating through the whole country; and it was profoundly affecting the intellectual and spiritual life of Oxford society. Its influence was of course chiefly felt by the thoughtful few; but it was by no means limited to them. It permeated more or less the whole mass. There was then no such pressure or popularity of games and athleticism as there is now to fill the minds of even some of the ablest of the undergraduates, and to keep many of them boys. To all the varied social, literary, and academic interests, which supplied then, as they do to-day, material for the debating societies and for the ceaseless talk of the scholars' table, the wine-party, and the constitutional, there was added this

¹ He writes to his sister about the proposed cathedral at Calcutta and the meagre subscriptions: "Katy, I do think Romish superstition better than our niggardliness." (Nov. 11, 1840.)

mysterious growing spirit, undefined as yet, which had recently acquired the recognised name of Tractarianism. It was omnipresent; it was endlessly discussed; it was distrusted; it was feared; but it could not be ignored. No one could see to what it was tending. It interrupted to some extent the literary life of the University; but it resulted in a moral quickening, a stimulating warmth, a heightened pulse of spiritual life. It not only moved the intellectual men to more anxious thoughtfulness, and the devout to greater devotion, but it gave a certain shade of seriousness even to the boisterous.

Perhaps the rumour and ripple of the movement had reached to quiet Axon and Tiverton; but Temple cannot have really felt it till, at the age of seventeen, he was taken from his simple farmstead home and Grammar School studies, and placed in the very vortex of the movement. In his first year at Oxford he is writing home about the *Tracts for the Times*, which he is reading. His letters constantly refer to sermons he has heard, conversations he has held.¹

The movement was more than an Oxford

¹ On October 2, 1840, he writes to his mother: "Dr. Pusey preached before the University last Sunday one of the most beautiful sermons I ever heard. He seemed to touch every chord of one's heart in succession; but I was pained to see that though his sermon was decidedly orthodox and right as far as it went, yet by stopping short he gave us directions which are neither more nor less than those of the Council of Trent."

He writes on January 30, 1841: "It is King Charles's Day (or rather was, for all ecclesiastical days begin after sunset), and it is always, I am sorry to say, made an occasion of displaying passion. Many men who never otherwise go more than once to chapel have been there twice to-day; and some have risked the displeasure of the Dean by absenting themselves altogether. There is a great question as to whether the service is inserted by competent authority, and our mathematical lecturer Mr. Ward absented himself on that ground."

On February 8, 1841, he gives his mother a long account of a walk and conversation with W. G. Ward upon the Church of Rome and England. Ward gave him the 4th and 5th volumes of Newman's sermons, finding that he knew the 1st and 3rd. He dines with him on the 9th.

movement. Concentrated in that focus were all the elements of an English movement, and all seen in their most distinct forms. There was the immense hopefulness that a new age was at hand, and that if right principles could but be clearly seen and strongly stated, all would acknowledge them, and the new age be rightly modelled.

And now let us turn from this brief analysis of the "atmosphere" of the time and place to look at the young scholar as he struck his contemporaries.

In the winter of 1888-89 Miss Temple, the Archbishop's elder sister, wrote to the then Master of Balliol to ask for some reminiscences of her brother's Oxford days. Dr. Jowett's reply was as follows :—

FROM THE MASTER OF BALLIOL COLLEGE, OXFORD

DEAR MISS TEMPLE—You ask me to give you some account of your brother, the Bishop of London, when he was at Oxford. I shall speak quite freely to you, and I shall leave you to make any use of my letter which you may think fit.

I have always thought him the finest young man whom we ever had at Balliol. He was so good and simple; he had such uncommon force of mind and power of acquiring knowledge. I have seldom, if ever, known any one like him. He came up to Oxford a lad from the country who had very little experience of life; but he at once made his mark and won the respect of his fellows. His perseverance and self-denial were extraordinary. That he might not be a burden to his friends, he used to practise a rather severe economy. He would sit without a fire in the depth of winter. No one laughed at this; his kind and genial ways gained the goodwill of us all. I remember a jest of some Balliol men, which shows what was thought of him. They made a Tripos of the men in the College who were distinguished, not for their learning, but for their good manners; your brother was unanimously voted a first-class. He was always liberal and generous, as he continued to be through life. It could not be said of him that he had not got the chill of poverty out of his bones, for he had never had it in him. He had a loud and hearty laugh, and was quite free from shyness.

The high spirits of youth made him at times a little uproarious. When he became a College tutor, he was a tower of strength. On his leaving us to go to Kneller Hall it was truly said of him that "no departure from Oxford would make a greater hole in any College."¹

He came up to Oxford a first-rate mathematician, but with a much smaller stock of classics; which, however, during the three years following he so much improved that he was *proxime accessit* for the Ireland University Scholarship. Shortly afterwards he obtained a double-first, the classical and mathematical parts of the examination being within a few weeks of each other.²

Almost immediately after he took his degree he became mathematical tutor at Balliol College. During the five years which succeeded he read a good deal of German philosophy, and was one of the few Englishmen who understood what he read. In those days he and I were much together; he was one of the kindest of friends, and though he was four years younger than myself, I learnt a great deal from him. He had thought more than most of us, and had great powers of influencing his contemporaries. Our common friends at that time were A. H. Clough, the late Dean of Westminster, W. G. Ward, Constantine Prichard, Lord Coleridge, James Riddell, Edwin Palmer, the late Dean of Rochester, Professor J. C. Shairp, William Spottiswoode, Professor F. T. Palgrave, and there were others. Those were the days of the *Tracts for the Times* and the *Ideal of a Christian Church*, and young men could not help being very much interested in the theological discussions which arose out of them. Your brother was far from being unaffected, but was not carried away by them.

Any one who knew him as an undergraduate would have

¹ In the discussion on the value of close fellowships in connection with University reform some one said that "at any rate Balliol seemed to be 'run' by one man, and he was a 'close' fellow."

² The classical examination ended May 2, and the mathematical examination began May 23. In a letter written in the interval he tells his mother: "I went to the concert of the Amateur Musical Society, and enjoyed myself extremely; they have a very good band, and played some overtures of Glück's and Mozart's quite beautifully. Their singing I did not much admire. The Italian songs sounded absurd enough mouthed out *à la* John Bull."

It may be noted that he was the first person for many years who had obtained a first-class without the help of a private tutor. He mentions to his mother that this had saved him £50.

prophesied that he would be a distinguished man if he lived. There were some of his contemporaries at Balliol who had more cleverness and more originality; but in none of them was there the same interpenetration of moral and intellectual qualities, or the same simple-minded desire to do good, under the control of good sense. He was the reverse of ignorant of the world, and had made many observations on human nature. He was quite free from vanity, and never seemed to think about himself: a little brusque perhaps, and not always understanding what a friend felt or said, because he had no similar susceptibilities himself. I remember nothing which he said or did during his undergraduate career at Oxford which was foolish or weak or wrong. His character and conversation were a blessing to all who knew him.

When I came to visit you at Axon in the summer of 1843,¹ and saw his country home, of which he told me that he had planted the shrubs and trees himself, and became acquainted with your venerable mother, I partly understood how such a character was formed, and how fortunate he had really been in the circumstances of his early life.

I am sorry to hear of your blindness. I do not wonder at your wishing to gather up some fragments of the past.—
Believe me, yours very sincerely, B. JOWETT.

BALL. COLL., Feb. 13, 1889.

To this recollection by Jowett we must add the well-known description by J. C. Shairp in his poem on the Balliol Scholars:—

There, too, was one, broad-browed, with open face,
And frame for toil compacted—him with pride
A school of Devon from a rural place
Had sent to stand these chosen ones beside:
From childhood trained all hardness to endure,
To love the things that noble are, and pure,
And think and do the truth whate'er betide.
With strength for labour, "as the strength of ten,"
To ceaseless toil he girt him night and day:
A native King and ruler among men,
Ploughman or Premier, born to bear true sway:
Small or great duty never known to shirk,
He bounded joyously to sternest work—
Less buoyant others turn to sport and play.

Really in the early summer of 1841.

The following letter from Dr. Scott, the tutor of Balliol, to Lord Selborne, is of special interest :—

MY DEAR PALMER—I am tempted to trouble you by the hope that you may be useful to a very deserving man, without much inconvenience to yourself.

My friend is Frederick Temple, a Blundell Scholar of Balliol, who is a candidate for a small Exhibition in the gift of the Mercers' Company, just vacated by Jowett on his becoming actual Fellow.

He is very, very poor; his mother is the widow of a Major Temple, a distinguished engineer,¹ who, I believe, had the charge of fortifying Genoa in the late war—was afterwards employed in the Ionian Isles, where his son was born, and died Governor of Sierra Leone. When at Tiverton School he himself had the charge and tuition of a younger brother; and it is now only by a fortunate chance that he has been relieved from the alternative of either quitting the University or giving up half his time to pupils if he could get them.²

His character is most admirable; all who have known him assure me that he has gone through trials terrible to a boy, and has gone through them in the best possible way. Since he has been here I can speak of him as the most exemplary man in College, without exception; as a model to all his contemporaries in his religious duties, and industry in all branches of his studies.

These are the grounds on which I should wish to ground my request that you would make use of your interest in the Court of the Mercers' Company in his favour. The fact is that he is at present only enabled to remain at Oxford by a private arrangement, of which he is himself not fully aware. This will, I trust, be continued; but still it is of such nature as to leave his claim of poverty as strong as it possibly could be.

You will be well pleased, I trust, to hear in addition that he is intellectually also a young man of truly first-rate promise.³ I can speak of him as a very good scholar; and as a mathematician I am assured by Ward that his acquirements are quite extraordinary—such as, in the opinion of

¹ See p. 1.—Ed.

² In May 1840 he was still taking a pupil, Henry Blackmore, a boy of fourteen who was preparing for the Army, and giving him one hour each day.

competent judges to whom he has shown his papers, would ensure his first-class *now*, within his second term of residence. You will not be surprised at my being a warm pleader for such a very remarkable client. Let him once take his degree, and my phoenix cannot but prosper; but in the meanwhile he has a hard and dispiriting struggle to make. I trust that I have made out a case which will induce you to help me in getting something done for him. The £20 a year, which the vacant Exhibition is worth, would be a large sum to him; I could answer for its being as well managed as it would be bestowed.

I have stated the facts of his poverty broadly to you; but, for his sake, of course you will exercise a discretion as to showing the account. Where it is important, pray let me to beg you to do so: otherwise, in kindness to his feelings, let generalities suffice.

When do you wend towards Oxford? We took a very exemplary Wykehamist (Fanshawe) for one of our scholars the other day.

If you can do anything towards furthering my object you will, believe me, be doing a very great favour to myself, as well as to Temple.—Ever truly yours,

(Sgd.) ROBERT SCOTT.

BALLIOL,
December 2, 1839.

Little need be added to this picture; but an extract from Miss Temple's memoranda, quoted in previous chapters, must be given: it gives a picture of him in his vacations:—

In the vacations he used to come home, sometimes arriving by the coach at two o'clock in the morning, wheeling his portmanteau in a wheel-barrow. He roused us with extraordinary calls, and I can still see him sitting on his mother's bed and having some supper, and telling her all that had been done and said. It was like some one coming from an enchanted world, bringing some new book, and talk of men of interest and intellect; it was to us like a taste of Paradise. He had a little slit of a bedroom, with no fireplace, and there he used to study. I remember his swinging on the chair till he wore the carpet into holes, marching up and down the little room till he wore out a track on the carpet. We all respected the study, and heard from below the swing and the stride—a sort of exuberance of strength.

He was full of life and vigour^o and joyousness, and 'came among us like a fresh breeze.

At this time he was open in his talk about the beginning of the Oxford Movement. Amongst other books he brought down the *Fairy Bower*¹ and the *Lost Brooch*, by Newman's sister, Mrs. Mozley. Then he brought down Jowett with him. I remember him in our square pew in the church, when our choir with fiddles and various instruments were playing the Hallelujah Chorus. He covered his face in his hands, and finally slid down on to the ground to cover his laughter. Time went on. F. took his double-first; and then began a time when he took pupils, and his long vacations were cut short.

To this picture of the young Blundell Scholar as he came up to Balliol must be added the fact that he started with some disadvantages. The Master, Dr. Jenkyns, was frank in his dislike of Blundell Scholars; partly because he could not throw these scholarships open to general competition: partly because, as was natural, on a very limited foundation, their holders had generally been men of inferior intellectual calibre.²

Temple had, however, a strong personal regard for Dr. Jenkyns. At the Balliol dinner given to the Archbishop in 1897 he spoke of his life as an undergraduate, and dwelt particularly on his singular good fortune in having had a seat at the scholars' table in such society. Then he referred to what had been said by previous speakers of Jenkyns, and spoke of his own immense reverence for the Master's memory. "One day," he said, "when I was passing into the garden quad, the Master saw

¹ On this book there is much correspondence between him and his sisters.

² In 1842, Temple wrote to Scott: "What do you think of the Master? He almost insulted me the day after the Class list came out. He sent for me, and after numerous congratulations he told me, 'You Blundell Scholars have certainly very great advantages; coming up as you do very *inferior* men into the society of very *superior* men: some of you are improved by it, and some are not.' I really could hardly keep my countenance, and was very near laughing in his face."

me from his window and called me up to his room. 'Young man,' he said, 'I wish to be regarded as a father by all the undergraduates, and I wish so to be regarded by you; and you must let me give you that'—and he put a £10 note into my hands. Of course I was very much ashamed to take it, but at that time I was very poor—it was a question whether I should be able to stay at Oxford—and I took it, and I shall never forget it to the end of my life."

A fellowship fell vacant just before Temple was twenty-one years old. The Master told him that it was impossible under the statutes to elect him; but that if he wanted money the Fellows had agreed to advance it to him out of the College funds. "He spoke very kindly, and I do not think I ever thought him so amiable in my life."

Mr. Temple gave important evidence before the Universities Inquiry Commission of 1850; and in answer to questions as to necessary expenses he put in copies of what were, presumably, his own college bills. Prior to entry, charges were incurred to the amount of £72:13:1, of which £36:8:1 was sunk, and the rest repaid. The total expense in the first year was £83:17:8½, and in the second year £88:11:3½.¹

| ¹ Received 1840 | | Spent 1840 | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------------|-----------|
| Balance from 1839 | £15 11 3 | Journeys | £13 6 0 |
| Scholarship | 15 0 0 | Furniture | 1 14 0 |
| From Mamma | 5 0 0 | Battells and dues | 25 5 3 |
| Mr. Saunders's Exhib. | 15 0 0 | Servants | 4 2 8 |
| Mr. Scott's Exhib. | 15 0 0 | Servants' bills | 6 2 8 |
| Present from Mr. W. Thorold | 10 0 0 | Books | 4 0 6 |
| Mr. Scott's Exhib. | 20 0 0 | Tailor | 10 0 5 |
| On acct. of Scholarship | 15 0 0 | Grocer | 3 11 11 |
| | | Washing, mending, etc. | 4 0 6 |
| | | Shoes | 2 10 1 |
| | | Allowance | 3 12 6 |
| | | Bank | 0 2 0 |
| | | Balance | 32 2 9 |
| | <u>£110 11 3</u> | | |
| | | | £110 11 3 |

This balance enabled him to help his mother materially, and also justified the foreign trip mentioned, in which his companion was Jelf.

We learn from Miss Temple's memoranda that he rapidly won scholarships¹ enough to maintain himself, living the most frugal life. Even after he fully maintained himself he used to send full accounts to his mother for every penny except about 2s. 6d. a week, for which he did not account, but reserved as pocket-money. In April 1841, he was in sufficiently easy circumstances to allow himself a trip to Antwerp and Brussels.

Such, then, was the atmosphere, and such the man; and now some attempt must be made to analyse the nature of his intellectual and spiritual development during those years of growth and solidification.

It is evident that he owed much to his tutors. To Tait in particular he acknowledged, on more than one occasion, the greatest intellectual obligations; and they were in close sympathy. His friendship and great respect for Scott, and frequent visits to him for reading during the vacations, must also have been a strong and inspiring force in his life.²

Moreover, he fell at once under the influence of W. G. Ward. Temple, by his own private studies at school, came up considerably ahead of his contemporaries in mathematics, and W. G. Ward most kindly took him alone, to look over his work once a week for an hour. Ward was brilliant in pure mathematics, but confessedly unable to help his pupils in applied mathematics. In 1841 Temple writes:—

The only thing I can complain of in Oxford is the low

¹ One of these² was the Senior Exhibition from the Mercers' Company, noticed above. In December 1839, he also received an anonymous letter enclosing a £10 note.

² In 1840 Scott went down to the College living of Duloe. In one of Temple's letters to his mother, dated June 6, 1840, he writes: "I do not believe there ever was a tutor who took so deep an interest in all entrusted to him."

state of science. They have not a single book on logic worth reading, and metaphysics and moral philosophy are at a very low ebb. Mathematics are still lower.

Mr. Ward, the Archbishop related,¹ looked over his exercises, correcting them with extraordinary rapidity, showing here and there easier methods, noting interesting mathematical points in the various possible mathematical solutions. But he goes on to say that the hour was about equally divided between algebra or the differential calculus and conversation, sometimes on the drama or opera, but later on, as Ward attached himself to the Tractarian party, more often on theology and the prospects of the Church of England.

This might have been a most powerful influence. Lord Coleridge speaks of Ward as one of the cleverest and most brilliant men he ever had met. So also does Huxley. All his contemporaries speak of him as the most attractive and persuasive man of his day. At first Ward and Temple had a common bond, not only as mathematicians, but in their earnestness, their attention to moral discipline, their stand against worldliness, and their dislike of scientific materialism; but very soon, as Ward developed the new phase of Tractarianism, Temple's letters show that a divergence was felt.

The University was then far more theological than it is now. The new phase of Tractarianism was just taking shape. Hitherto, under its three acknowledged leaders,—Newman, Keble, and Pusey,—the attractive power of the movement had lain in its appeal for the restoration of the Catholic element of Anglicanism. But *The Remains of Hurrell Froude*, which had been published in 1838, and the ardent temperaments of Ward and Oakeley were giving birth to a new power, of which the issue was still uncertain, though it suggested Rome. It was

¹ *W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement* p. 41.

commonly said that Ward had at one time a strong desire to capture Temple and transfer him to his own camp. But Temple stood four-square, and was not to be moved.

To begin with, Temple was not drawn to ecclesiasticism. Men may be in an ecclesiastical atmosphere without becoming ecclesiastics. What Robert Wilberforce said of Thomas Mozley was true also of Temple, that "a fish might be long in the sea without becoming salt." Moreover, he was protected from such unsettlement by his intense application to the duty of the day. This was then, as always, his marked characteristic. He could impose on himself intellectual limitations.¹

The contrast between Arthur Clough and Temple in this point is very illuminating. Clough, who was two years Temple's senior, had not this faculty of self-limitation. He, too, was industrious, but his mind was of a different cast. He was brilliant, imaginative, and discursive.² Theology presented itself to him as too important to be other than the duty of the day. He spoke of himself as "having been for two years like a straw drawn up the draught of a chimney." Clough saw his own danger. He wrote in 1838: "One thing, I suppose,

¹ On March 8, 1841, he writes to his mother: "I fear we shall have some disturbance here soon, for several college tutors—amongst others, Mr. Tait—have published a protest against the last *Tract for the Times*. Newman himself was the author of that Tract, and it is said to be very violent. I have not read it, nor do I intend to do so, as I see an evident disposition in some of the fellows of colleges to get the undergraduates to take sides in the controversy, which I shall certainly not do."

On March 23rd, he notes that the Tract was sold out in three days, and not reprinted: "The pamphlets and letters, denunciations, explanations, and replies, etc., that have come out are innumerable; and it would be hardly fair in any one to enter into the controversy without reading all."

² Of A. H. Clough the late Archbishop said: "He seemed to me, when first I knew him, the ablest and greatest man I had ever come across, and the one from whom I had learned more than from any other man I knew."

is clear—that one must leave the discussion of τὰ Νεανδρωπικά, κ.τ.λ. snug and quiet, for after one's degree." But his was not the temperament to abstain.¹

Ward afterwards speaks sorrowfully of his own forcing of Clough's mind :—

What was before all things to have been desired for him was that during his undergraduate course he should have given himself up thoroughly to his classical and mathematical studies ; that he should have kept up the habits of prayer and Scripture reading which he brought with him from Rugby ; but should have kept himself aloof from plunging prematurely into the theological controversies then so rife at Oxford,—I cannot to this day think of all this without a bitter pang of self-reproach.

Temple was never so carried away. Hence there was in Temple no breach of continuity, no sudden awakening. It is seen from his letters that he assimilated all which his upbringing and temperament made it possible for him to assimilate ; and the rest left him unaltered but not unmoved.

That he passed through a time of some degree of mental anxiety is evident from his letters. He discusses Newman's *Church of the Fathers*, the *Bishopric of Jerusalem*, mediæval miracles, articles in the *Quarterly Review*, doctrinal differences with Rome, and the sermons that he heard in the University Church. "I have been reading Gibbon lately," he writes to his mother, "and think I shall go through with him ; but his constant sneer at everything good and great is worse than Hume, and his style has not the charm of Hume to carry that off. He is always on stilts, and I am even now very tired of him." He greatly enjoys Wordsworth, and remarks, "He invests the most commonplace things and commonplace language with a religious feeling which makes them beautiful."

¹ *Prose Remains*, Clough, p. 78.

Every question was among some of his friends an open question. Strauss and Comte, Mill and Bentham, Coleridge, Carlyle, and Maurice appear as factors again and again in the discussions of that time. But nothing seems to have disturbed his balance; "his heart stood fast." His habit of obedience to his mother, and his intense affection for her, had insensibly passed into strict obedience to conscience. Perhaps one of the chief lessons of his early life is that this affectionate obedience is the soil in which faith flourishes.

His love of the daily services of the Church began early. In his first long vacation he writes from Oxford:—

I intend to go to our parish church for evening service in future as long as I am here in the vacation. It is the only comfort that I know belonging to town life that one can have morning and evening service every day.

So, on March 23, 1842, in Holy Week, he writes:—

I do not know any place I like better than Oxford for spending this week. I look back every year with sorrow at not having taken more advantage from the services of the week, and the various thoughts they are calculated to call up. And when I think of the extreme minuteness with which the Evangelists have preserved even the slightest incidents of our Lord's life just at this time, I feel as if the whole week spent in prayer would not be too much to commemorate it.

His enthusiasm for Foreign Missions is illustrated by a letter of November 13, 1841, to his sister Katy:—

I trust we are not living in a degenerate age. I think it not unlikely that England may assume the sublimest position ever occupied by any nation hitherto, that of the authoritative propagator of the Gospel over the world.

So in October 1841 he writes to his mother :—

We had the Bishop of New Zealand here the other day, just before his departure. He takes out several clergymen with him, and several young men to be ordained by and by. Is it not a grand sight, and worthy of the Christian Church, to see a bishop going out with a body of Christian clergy and of Christian youths intended for the same sacred profession, going to a heathen and barbarous nation to risk their lives for the propagation of the Gospel? I hope we shall soon have done with the littleness of yearly sending out a few individual missionaries at the expense of a private society, and that in future we shall continue the same glorious part. It is not mere momentary enthusiasm with me, mamma; my heart beats whenever I think of it. I think it one of the noblest things England has done for a long time, almost the only thing really worthy of herself.

He taught in the St. Ebbe's Sunday School; and finds the boys "astonishingly superior in quickness and in knowledge to the country boys of Culmstock."

He does not seem to have ever felt the intellectual necessity of perfect historic continuity which so deeply affected Newman,¹ nor was he inspired by the ecclesiastical ideals of Ward; though not insensible either to these or to the devout poetry of Keble, and the massive learning and piety of Pusey. But the central conviction of his young mind and heart was the utter supremacy of morality and righteousness—what he learned from Kant at an early stage of his Oxford days to call "the categorical imperative of duty." This conviction, which was implanted in him by the grace of God, developed in him by the example and teaching of father, mother, and sisters, determined

¹ But he writes to his mother, November 6, 1842: "With regard to preaching on the apostolical succession, I think it is certainly a part of God's truth, and I do not think ought to be dropped out of sight, even of those who come to church. Do you not think, dearest mamma, it makes a practical difference whether we regard the Church as a channel of grace, or Christianity as entirely an *individual* thing, in which each man is to take care of himself?"

the one note of character, and the one principle of action, that marked his long life.

The discussions that went on continually round him, and touched the most vital points of theology and ecclesiology, seemed to him to be not yet his business. Was there a *via media* between Romanism and Protestantism? Was Church reform to be settled by the State? Was dogma of the essence of Christianity? Could the religion of a nation become rationalistic? These and similar questions were agitating others, and his mind was fully open to their interest and importance; but they were not for him at that time; he had more direct duties for the hour. His mother's old admonition had sunk deep—"Freddy, don't argue; do your work." There was work to be done then, and all through his life; and work could not be done, if before he began he must look behind every door and curtain and cupboard.

The later developments of thought, which might perhaps have attracted him at that time, had scarcely begun. There was no such thing as Biblical criticism in England in the early decades of last century, or the Tractarian movement ignored it. Pusey's great work on the Minor Prophets is a mass of learning without criticism, looking at it from a modern historical and philosophical point of view. There is scarcely a remark in Newman's or Keble's sermons that suggests criticism. The world can only learn one lesson at a time; and the labour and learning of the Tractarians went in other directions.

The Tractarian school let science also rigidly alone. There was no denouncing of science. Keble seemed unconscious of it, and Pusey passed it by with indifference. Newman regarded science students with some impatience. He actively resented the vulgarity of the language indulged in

by some scientific men, who appeared to him, as Mozley says, "to have read nothing in the Bible except the first few chapters of Genesis."

The questions now raised by criticism and science were not yet open; and other paths of speculation or study did not attract Temple to follow them exclusively in search of a complete intellectual system. He had none of the "adventurousness of Ward": the desire to push to its extreme every logical inference which might be drawn from premises which seemed sound. His test, on the other hand, of the soundness of general premises lay in the conclusions that could apparently be drawn from them.

His diligence is enormous. He read very hard for both the classical and mathematical schools, and was studying on many other lines simultaneously.¹ On May 11, 1841, he writes to his mother:—

I had a party this morning to introduce young Coleridge (the brother of my old friend, just come up) to some of my acquaintances, and altogether it took up at least two hours; time is precious with me now, for my hands are quite full. I have just commenced a mathematical book in four folio volumes,² extremely hard. It is a tremendous undertaking, and I must have it over by Christmas or I shall not have time for my degree work; and, moreover, I cannot read it during the vacation, for I cannot afford to buy the book, and I have taken it out of the library. None of my work has such a hold upon me as mathematics. With much of the rest, except the divinity, I feel as if it were barren work; but in this I get so interested that I cannot stop.

¹ Incidentally it appears from his letters that he is learning German. He reads widely in history. On June 7, 1841, after writing about Ward's deprivation of his fellowship, he mentions that Jowett has got the Latin Prize Essay, "and I am very glad of it; for when he was writing it I happened to be reading Miccalli's *History of the Etruscans*, and as the subject was the Etruscan manners and laws, and he could not read Italian, I went to his room and translated it into English."

² Probably Laplace's *Mécanique Céleste*.

The study of Frederick Temple as an undergraduate gives us, in conclusion, the impression of a young man of singularly strong principles and firm character, of vigorous physique and of a very affectionate nature, not poetical or imaginative, joyous in the extreme, but more than self-controlled; possessed by a passion of obedience to the calls of the spiritual life; of unusual power of acquiring and mastering knowledge and thought; not precocious in opinion, or easily influenced, but obedient to his mother's lightest wish; one who was, consciously or unconsciously, biding his time, destined to go on growing for two more generations of men. Among his contemporaries were men more brilliant in conversation and debate, men who surpassed him in literary taste and charm, or in special lines of study and research; but among all his contemporaries none in equal degree combined wide knowledge, enormous industry, a genius for efficiency, with all those indefinable qualities of intellect which give judgment, and those of character which constitute weight. At no age, from boyhood upwards, was he otherwise than a man of weight.

APPENDIX TO CHAPTER V

NOTE ON THE ARCHBISHOP'S MATHEMATICAL AND SCIENTIFIC POWERS AND ATTAINMENTS, BY ARCHDEACON WILSON

The curriculum of study for a first class in mathematics prior to 1852 embraced only about two-thirds of the amount then required at Cambridge. The mathematical papers set at that time included, besides all the elementary subjects and the differential and integral calculus, some sections of Newton with problems deducible, and mechanics, including rigid dynamics, with hydrostatics, geometrical and physical optics, and astronomy. Cambridge mathematicians who

migrated to Oxford Fellowships, used to regard an Oxford First Class in Mathematics at that time to be only equivalent to a high Senior Optime or a low Wrangler. The problems set demanded, however, a thorough grasp of principles, but no great analytical dexterity. But Dr. Temple's mathematical gifts were of a higher and an unusual order. His reading was very wide. His insight into the essence of a problem and his attack were very quick and direct. He continued, moreover, to read mathematics for pleasure for some years after he left Oxford, and mastered some part at least of Sir W. R. Hamilton's very difficult work on Quaternions. He shared with me the teaching of the highest Mathematical "Set" at Rugby, and this gave me special opportunities of seeing his mathematical work. His favourite subject was geometrical conic sections; and we often compared solutions of the more difficult problems that came out in new text-books. Mine were often shorter, but seemed to him, and really were, accidental relations. His were almost invariably deduced from elementary properties of the figure, and were, therefore, far better teaching.

But the peculiarity of his mathematical ability lay in his power of visualising space relations and numbers. This will be best understood by some examples.

I was teaching geometry of three dimensions at Rugby, and I showed to Dr. Temple a boy's solution of the problem, "How many spheres can be described to touch the four planes, all indefinitely produced, which form the surface of an irregular tetrahedron?" (a triangular pyramid). The boy found, of course, that one could be inscribed, and four escribed to the four faces, touching them externally, and added that six more could be escribed to what might be called the "hip-roofed" spaces, of which each edge formed the ridge. Dr. Temple *instantly saw* that if a sphere could be escribed in one of these "hip-roofed" spaces, it could not be escribed in the space determined by the opposite edge of the tetrahedron, the "hips" being necessarily inclined at a wider angle than the "ridge slopes" in one of each pair. Readers can test their own power of such visualisation.

Another illustration of his peculiar mathematical insight will be interesting.¹ I had set a problem in the *Journal of Education*, "To give a proof of the fact that four colours

¹ I was not then aware that this was a very old problem. Its history is given in W. W. Rouse Ball's *Mathematical Recreations*.

were sufficient for the colouring of any map, say of counties or other areas, however interlaced, so that no two areas which had a boundary—not a point—in common should have the same colour.” Many attempts were made by mathematicians at a proof, but they confessed that none satisfied them. I sent the problem to Dr. Temple when Bishop of London. Months afterwards he wrote to me in May 1889: “I wrote the enclosed at an evening meeting of the — Society, when the vehement Mr. — was saying what I did not care to listen to.” The chief peculiarity of the solution is the restatement of the question in definite mathematical language. There can be four figures on the same plane, no one of which shall have a common part with any other, and every one shall be partially conterminous with every other, but there cannot be more than four. Then follows a figure which made his statement evident.¹

This story is incomplete without its sequel. The morning papers reported that “The Bishop of London was greatly interested in Mr. —’s speech, and was observed to be taking notes all the time he was speaking.”

I remember his being strongly attracted by a curious chance problem, of which I published a solution in the *Philosophical Magazine*: “If four points are taken at random on an infinite plane, to find the probability that one will fall inside the triangle formed by the other three.” Several solutions giving different results had been given, and he could not satisfy himself with any treatment of the question.

I once challenged him to Kirkman’s well-known problem of the fifteen young ladies.

A governess of great repute,
Young ladies had *fifteen*,
Who took their walks along the shore,
Or in the meadows green.

But as they walked they tattled and talked
In chosen *groups of three*,
Until their governess resolved,
Such trifling should not be.

For she would try for *one whole week*,
So to arrange them all,
That *no two girls a second time*
In the same rank should fall.

¹ *Journal of Education*, June 1, 1889.

This requires no mathematics beyond the knowledge of the fact that when you take one girl from fifteen there are seven different pairs left for her to walk with. Some may like to try and arrange the young ladies more quickly than he did. He brought me the solution in forty minutes. I have it in his own handwriting.

Another peculiarity of his mathematical powers may be mentioned—his power of *seeing, without counting*, comparatively large numbers.

Everybody *sees* three, not as two and one, but as three; most people see four; some see five, and even six; more frequently, careful observation of themselves will show that there is a rapid addition of three and two, or three and three. But Dr. Temple certainly *saw* higher numbers. I tested him quite suddenly more than once—How many sheep in that field? Instantly came the answer *nine*: once he *saw* thirteen; I think these were birds flying in a group. It was the same process with him to see nine or ten volumes in a bookshelf as it was with me to see five. Given time, even without counting, he saw larger numbers.

When Bishop of Exeter he told me that he discovered in this way that boys were in the habit of coming to be confirmed a second time. The clergyman would bring the list to the vestry with, say, 40 names on it. "But there were 43," said the Bishop. "No, my Lord, only 40," was the reply. "But I *saw* 43." "Did your Lordship count them?" "No, I *saw* them," and it turned out that he was right.¹

He had an unusual knowledge of prime numbers; and one of his recreations in his latest years was an endeavour to find some law governing the occurrence of a prime, and to find the greatest series of consecutive numbers without a prime.

The latest proof of his geometrical insight was related to me by his son, Mr. F. C. Temple, now (1903) an engineer in the Birmingham Water Works near Rhayader. He was instructed to design and provide working drawings for the junction between two lengths of a tunnel, of which the sections were different. The problem is highly technical, and somewhat novel. The brick lining must give the same resisting power. The transition is effected by the use of stones of a truncated wedge shape. Mr. Temple explained

¹ See also "Exeter" Memoir, p. 358.—En.

his design to his father during the Coronation week; the Archbishop mastered it, and on the following day said that at one point, which he named, the design was in error. He gave no reason; but when the work was put in hand a month later, he was found to be right in his remark.

When an undergraduate he learned a good deal of biological science at Oxford; and in preparation for his work at Kneller Hall he mastered the elements of chemistry and physics, and taught in the laboratory. He certainly had a very thorough and by no means elementary knowledge. I was constantly surprised to find how much he knew. On one occasion Babbage was staying at the Schoolhouse, Rugby, soon after the autumn of 1860, when the famous paper by Bunsen and Kirchhoff on Spectrum Analysis appeared. I had bought one of the first spectroscopes made by Elliott, and Dr. Temple brought Babbage to see it, and get me to test its powers of detecting minute traces of metals. I never had to pass such an ordeal of close catechisation by two skilled examiners before or since.

I well remember, too, when I was reading Herbert Spencer's *First Principles*, and distrusted my own conclusion that the physics and mathematics of the first book were hopelessly confused, that I talked it over with Dr. Temple. He had come to exactly the same conclusion. So also, I found later, had Mr. J. Fletcher Moulton, who exposed the confusions in the *British Quarterly Review* for October 1873, and for January 1874, and I believe some of the errors were corrected in later editions.

I may mention here that his power of hearing, or rather of disentangling confused sounds, was exceptional. I remember his telling me at Rugby that he did not like dining in hall with the boys, because he could not help hearing what they were saying at all the tables.

Few men were more thoroughly qualified than was Dr. Temple, both by training and habit of mind, to give the Bampton Lectures on science and religion.

CHAPTER VI

LIFE AS FELLOW AND TUTOR OF BALLIOL, 1842-1848

Double first-class—College lecturer—Junior Dean—Ordination, 1846—Tract XC.—Stanley's *Life of Dr. Arnold*—Ward's *Ideal of a Christian Church*—Growth of liberal spirit in Temple—Letters to his mother—His family at Oxford—Sympathy with social and educational movements—Reminiscences from the Rev. Lewis Campbell, M.A., LL.D.—Mr. C. S. Roundell—Sir W. J. Farrer—Dr. Hornby.

It was in May 1842 that Temple obtained his double first-class in classics and mathematics, and took his degree of B.A. After a short time in Belgium with his sister, Mrs. Thorold, where Jelf joined him, he took a reading-party to Dolgelly. In the November of the same year he was appointed Lecturer in Balliol, in mathematics and in logic, lecturing also in classics. He thus succeeded W. G. Ward, who had resigned his lectureship to Dr. Jenkyns in the same year. In the autumn of 1843 his mother decided on letting Axon, and came up to Oxford at her son's request, and lived with her daughters, at first in St. John's Street, and subsequently at 33 Beaumont Street.

In 1845 he became Junior Dean of his college; and in 1846 he was ordained Deacon, and in 1847 Priest, by the Bishop of Oxford, S. Wilberforce. Many years afterwards, in speaking of this period to Mr. H. Lee Warner, he said: "If I had life over again I would do some things differently; but

I have never for a moment regretted taking Holy Orders." In the spring of 1848 he resigned his fellowship, and went down from Oxford to enter on the work described in the subsequent chapters. Thus briefly are summed up the chief academic events of his life as a Fellow and Tutor of Balliol.¹

If we are to form any mental picture of his development during these years of his life as a Fellow, we must recall, however briefly, some of those exciting events that were then, in rapid succession, taking place at Oxford, and that touched him closely. It was on February 27, 1841, that the famous Tract XC. was published,² and raised the storm that after sixty years is not forgotten. It is true that even then there were some few to whom "the din about Tract XC. seemed an empty clamour about obsolete machinery." But this was not the prevailing thought. The most far-seeing men of every school perceived that, as Luther said about a treatise of Erasmus, "this was a blow aimed at the throat." Within ten days the "Protest of the Four Tutors" was published in the *Times*. The Tract was publicly condemned by the Heads of Houses, who were supposed to be guardians of orthodoxy; and their condemnation was affixed to the college butteries in June of that year for all to read. Mr. Ward, Temple's friend and mathematical tutor, in consequence of his avowal that he held doctrines regarded as distinctively Roman, resigned his two lectureships. Let us recall that, in this same year, Arnold was lecturing to large audiences at Oxford, on modern history, and Keble gave his last lecture on poetry.

In June 1842 Dr. Arnold died suddenly at Rugby; and Tait, to whose friendship and wisdom

¹ When at Kneller Hall he signed his name as "Late Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College, Oxford." The distinction between lecturer and tutor appears not to have been at that time emphasised.

² It was dated "The festival of St Paul, 1841." (January 25.)

Temple owed so much, vacated his tutorship at Balliol to succeed him; Jowett, already a close friend of Temple, succeeding Tait as tutor. Temple himself, as already mentioned, became Lecturer of Balliol,¹ and afterwards a Fellow, having declined in September an offer of a mastership under Tait at Rugby.²

In 1843 Newman resigned St. Mary's, preaching his last Anglican sermon in September,³ and was by many believed to be preparing to leave the English Church.

There was widespread uneasiness and distrust, amounting almost to panic. As a consequence, in the same autumn, Pusey's sermon on the Eucharist was condemned, on grounds unstated; and its author, without being heard in his own defence, was suspended for two years from preaching. This action added to the uneasiness, and in addition

¹ On January 26, 1843, he describes his work to his mother. Each week he gives three lectures in the Rhetoric, each taking two hours to prepare; three in Thucydides, which he needed only to "brush up"; two in Livy, which he knew "nearly by heart"; two in Plautus, each requiring two hours to prepare; four in mathematics; and one in Latin prose; besides looking over the papers of twenty-five pupils; "altogether somewhat less than I anticipated."

² He was evidently much attracted by the idea of this offer, but considered that if the Master wished for his services his first duty was to the college.

³ Dr. Temple often, in later days, spoke of the occasion; the crowded church, the stillness, the sense of the breath being held while he (Newman) said, "I fear that on this occasion I may be somewhat prolix"; and then a sort of sigh of satisfaction as the hearers settled themselves down to listen.

He was immensely impressed with Newman's style and delivery, the perfect English, the great simplicity of manner, the only approach to oratorical effect being an occasional long pause,—which he believed to be perfectly natural, arising from the tension of thought, not an attempt at "effect" in any sense,—a pause which sometimes lasted long enough to thrill his hearers to an almost unbearable degree; and then the silvery voice in its wonderful clear tones broke the spell, and restored the nerves with its calm and quiet eloquence.

Of Newman's reading of the lessons he also often spoke; describing the reverent simplicity, "as if he were giving a message to which he himself was listening—in a kind of childlike manner—with his wonderful enunciation."

produced a feeling of insecurity and tyranny, 'bringing protests even from non-resident distinguished Oxford men, such as Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Justice Coleridge.

In the next year, 1844, two great books came out, each in its way a masterpiece of portraiture,—a biography, and what may be called an autobiography, Stanley's *Life of Dr. Arnold*, and Ward's *The Ideal of a Christian Church*. The latter was followed by a hail of pamphlets, to which Maurice and Donkin and Stanley and many others contributed; and issues and parties were strangely confused. In every common-room there was ceaseless discussion, both on the far-reaching questions involved, and on the methods to be adopted for attack and defence. It was decided by the authorities to be safer not to bring Ward before the Ecclesiastical Courts, or before the Vice-Chancellor, but before Convocation; and on February 13, 1845, Temple listened to Ward's memorable but vain defence before the clergy, crowded in the Sheldonian; and, along with all the Fellows of Balliol, voted in the minority (368 to 776) against the censure on Ward, and in the larger minority (511 to 568) against his degradation. Ward was degraded, and he almost immediately joined the Church of Rome in lay Communion, and married. He settled at Littlemore, retaining the friendship of Temple and the Fellows of Balliol.¹ These events, and Newman's secession to Rome, followed by the secessions of many others, mark the close of the Tractarian Movement in Oxford.

A new liberal and educational spirit, already

¹ He used to tell how the Wards were, in those days, very poor, and lived in a small cottage with a bell wire laid through the wall, in order to summon the neighbour's daughter to assist in household matters when required.

stirring, with which Temple was far more in sympathy, began to be set free. Men in Oxford began to breathe more freely, as after a thunder-storm. There was work to be done; indeed, there were vast arrears of work, both in the University and in the country, to be overtaken; and the great questions raised by the Tractarian party, though they had not been, and perhaps never will be settled, were relegated henceforth in Oxford to the second or third rank of importance.

But the anxious controversies of this period, and the ceaseless discussions of the Roman, Anglican, Evangelical, and Rationalist positions, left their permanent mark on Temple. They compelled a searching inquiry into principles; they intensified and deepened his instinctive and fundamental convictions; and convictions which had stood the strain of those storms at Oxford were not to be shaken by any storms that followed. It is no illusion to trace in later life the development of the principles he matured at Oxford, the self-reliance which comes from having passed through a great crisis, and the resolute justice generated by the memory of the evils which sprang from the injustice and the intolerant temper he then witnessed. His fundamental conviction was, that the path through which men come to the knowledge of religious truth must be one of fidelity to the light within. It was the spiritual, self-disciplinary, and practical duties of religion, in which he included readiness to accept constant growth in doctrine, that commanded his devotion now and ever. Writing to R. Lawson on November 30, 1847, he says:—

I had long felt the necessity of looking inward, not outward; of putting conscience above guidance; of valuing a revelation only so far as it is confirmed from within. . . . I have told you before that I considered growth in doctrine, in

one sense, the highest spiritual growth; in one sense, for it is the life of all the others. I do not deny how in another, and (for individuals) far the most important sense, it is very, very much the lowest. But I cannot do without it; and I subscribe with the most hearty faith to Newman's doctrine, that in change only, in perpetual progress, can truth be sought.

But it is his correspondence with his mother during the Oxford period that throws the fullest light on his spiritual development. This correspondence was very frequent until the autumn of 1843, when Mrs. Temple came to reside in Oxford: subsequently it is limited to the vacations.¹

BALLIOL, *February 12, 1843.*

I want you to tell me what you think; for you are not in the middle of a controversy, and can therefore think of things freely and fearlessly, and have not the temptation we have here, to shrink from the truth lest it should lead us wrong. That at least is one thing of which I am convinced, that no fear of consequences ought to make us afraid of what is right; nor are we endowed with the power of seeing consequences for the purpose of making us act with a view to them, so much as in order that we may feel the importance of what we do, and ponder it well before we do it. I am not, then, swayed by any such arguments as that by doing *so* you will be led to dissent, or by doing *so* you will be led to Romanism, if I am convinced that to do *so* is right. I will wish to go forth like Abraham at God's bidding, and not to know whither I was going. So far I feel a certainty which, I trust, nothing will slack. But when I go a step farther—a step which I can hardly help feeling is right—I am not so certain.

The reply appears to have come promptly—to cease discussion. His reply is very characteristic:—

¹ He used to say how he wrote to his mother every day, but the letters of this date seem to have been sent once a week. After his mother's death he wrote to his sister, Miss Temple, every day until her death. The few extracts here given may serve to illustrate that obedient devotion to his mother, which is already well known as one of the characteristics of his life.

BALLIOL, *February 16, 1843.*

Many thanks for your kind and ready answer to my letter. You have given me advice instead of instruction, and I believe you are right. I will try to do what you tell me, but I do not think you know what you are requiring of me. It is no very easy task to avoid expressing opinions here; and though I have long given up arguing, I have not found it a very slight undertaking to avoid saying what I think. However, I made up my mind to it last summer, in case I should go to Rugby; and since you wish it, I will do it here. I have been unhappy; but it was not, I sincerely believe and trust, from unwillingness to do my duty, but from perplexity. I believe you and everybody else must have felt at times the misery of picturing ideas far above what are written within our hearts, and of being unable to realise them. But I do not wish to indulge in romantic yearnings for an imaginary state of goodness; and I am fully aware that such fictions are so far from being the real road to their own object, that they rather impede one's progress.

BALLIOL, *February 21, 1843.*

We are told that the righteousness of faith spoke thus: "The word is nigh thee, even in thy mouth and in thy heart." Is not this the very temper I have been describing—which follows authority, but still knows the "Word" is in his own heart?

One thing I always feel: the more I read the Bible the more I see the reason of what I read; I see the doctrines are not only true because there, but also in themselves; and at the same time things take new lights, and I see what I never saw before. Surely there is but little thought in the land; meditation on God's truth is a practice almost lost amongst us; we are content to be Christians in the Church,—and not always there. We are content to hold on trust what surely we were intended to make our own. St. Paul evidently does not contemplate this deference to authority, so essential in the beginning, as likewise final: even he, an inspired Apostle, would not claim dominion over the faith of his converts. Shall we, who merely rest on *our own* interpretation of that inspiration, claim what he refused? Nay, he supposes the case of a man who differed from himself; yet he does not call upon him to submit his faith, but says, "If any man be otherwise minded, the Lord shall reveal even this unto him" (Phil. iii. 15). Those perhaps are happiest who have never

had doubt put into their heads; but that is not granted to the Church now; we must win by prayer, meditation, and obedience, what our want of union has lost. I will only say one thing more: that I have really tried to be careful of my speech, and have not yet, I believe, in any way broken your commands. I mention it, lest, because I have spoken freely, you should think I was not so careful to be obedient. I am afraid you will find much not very clear in what I have said; but I have so little time that I am obliged to compress a good deal.

April 14, 1843.

. . . Is it not at present the Church of the rich and not of the poor? I cannot help feeling doubts whether in the Reformation much was not cast away which was intended for, and suited, the poor; and there has been little in its place. I confess I think the abolition of the compulsory confessional was a most hazardous experiment.¹ The result has been what the Reformers themselves never intended, that, notwithstanding all the efforts of Sanderson and Jeremy Taylor, the confessional has been quite lost from among us. Of all the instruments for the education of the poor this must have been one of the most powerful. Just consider what will be the condition of the Church if the Roman Catholics found an order of monks to preach to a class of men whom, to our shame, we have neglected, till they are almost, some more than almost, heathens,—I mean the poor in our manufacturing towns. For of all the vices that may be charged to any body of men, that of lukewarmness is the last that can be imputed to the Roman Catholics; but, for ourselves, I tremble, when I think of the Church of Laodicea. . . .

*

He studied scholastic theology very seriously; and was nearly induced to write an essay on St. Thomas Aquinas in a volume or series, of which his friend Prichard was editor. But the differences between their points of view were too serious. "I do not think his friends fair towards the Roman Catholics."

¹ The reader should refer to Dr. Temple's First Charge as Archbishop, on the subject of Confession. (Macmillan.)

In July 1847 he is at Bridlington Quay with a reading-party, and writes that he has abandoned Prichard's scheme :—

. . . The work would have suited me in some respects, but Jowett and Katy—no mean authorities, either of them—threw such decidedly cold water on it that I gave the matter up . . . so good-bye to St. Thomas Aquinas. . . . Meanwhile Jowett urges some labour of the same sort, and proposes various undertakings with magnificent names. . . . I always feel that it is specially incumbent on those who take the safe side, as I have done now, not to make it the lazy side.

The liberal and educational spirit spoken of above, which began now to move Oxford, manifested itself in two ways. One was in desire for University reform and for the promotion of learning. The episode of Tractarianism had so absorbed and distracted men's minds that there had been little desire or leisure for advancing the real aims of a University. The other, which began somewhat earlier, was a sympathy with the movement that had its origin elsewhere for ameliorating the condition of the poorest classes, and especially for bringing good elementary education within the reach of all. The part that Temple took in the former of these two movements will be sketched subsequently. The latter affected him very early and very strongly ; and, as events showed, had no small influence in determining the course of his life. He was profoundly moved and alarmed by the conditions of life, which he diligently studied, among the manufacturing, mining, and agricultural poor. In one of the few letters to his friend Robert Lawson that were not destroyed, he writes from Berwick, under date of April 27, 1848 :—

I have been reading Lamartine's *History of the Girondists*,

in the train. The horrible picture of the old French 'Revolution is enough to stir one's very blood. And as I was being whirled along, amidst the collieries of Durham and Northumberland, I could not help dreaming of the same brutality, the same wild determination to know no authority above self-interest, working the same awful ruin in England. An aristocratic government like ours (and what government is worth a farthing that is not aristocratic?) can only hold its place by two things—by that unswerving purity which makes it impossible for the people to mistrust it, and by that ready acknowledgment of superior talent which never allows real genius to feel itself degraded from its natural position. The latter is perhaps sufficiently done for the present; but the former!—what with Whig jobbery and patronage, Conservative intimidations at elections, and the terrible bribery which both persist in practising!! For nowadays institutions are no longer habits as they once were, but ideas. Men will not yield them obedience from the mere force of long usage; but they must be believed in and bear to be reflected on, and a terrible judgment awaits them if they will not bear it. All this education, which we are driving along as fast as we can, adds to the necessity. To educate without reforming is sure to produce revolution, as sunshine without rain is sure to injure the crops. To teach people how to criticise institutions, and not to enable the institutions to bear the criticism, is the maddest of follies.

The conditions of life among the working classes that thus oppressed him and stimulated him to action cannot here be described at length. Sufficient to say that twelve working hours out of the twenty-four was the minimum for young persons in the mills and factories; that in the coal-mines children of eight years old and under were employed for twelve or fourteen hours at a stretch, to open and close the doors in the dark passages. In workshops in the Midlands the children suffered incredibly, with the inevitable consequence of a low standard of morality. The agricultural labourers were crushed by poverty, isolation, and helplessness. In the winter of 1847-48 there was

widespread distress ; the outbreak of a revolution in Ireland was feared, and was only kept down by force. Chartism was formulating a definite programme, and alarming the comfortable world. Revolutions were breaking out in February in France ; and in March there were riots in many of our largest towns. On April 7, what was known as the "Gagging Act" was passed in a panic by an overwhelming majority in the House of Commons ; and on April 10 London was filled with troops, 100,000 special constables were enrolled, and some of the public offices were garrisoned and provisioned. The 10th of April left its mark on Temple.

And the education of the poor was on a par with the rest of their condition. The nation had scarcely begun to listen to the call for education which some of the clergy had long been making through the Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge and the National Society. When Temple went up to Oxford in 1839, Parliament was granting only £30,000 a year towards elementary education. This one fact implies that such elementary education as was given in the towns and villages was supplied by the Church, and, to some extent, by other religious bodies, their charity eking out the children's pence ; that the salaries of the teachers were low, and their qualifications no higher. It implied that vast numbers of children were receiving no education at all. When Lord Ashley brought in his resolution in 1843 for promotion by the State of national education, and in particular for the compulsory education of workhouse children, and of those employed in factories from the age of eight to thirteen, he was able to show that more than one million of children were receiving no education at all ; and that the national expenditure for

the punishment of crime was out of all proportion to that on education.¹

Temple's life cannot be understood by any one who does not realise the alarming condition of the nation, and the deep impression it made on him at this epoch in his career. There came, moreover, very early in his life as a Fellow, a still more personal call. In 1838 Parliament, moved by Lord John Russell and Lord Brougham, had been induced to make grants to the colleges established by religious bodies, or by private individuals, for training teachers in elementary schools. This was to lay a solid foundation for future progress. Oxford was among the first cities and dioceses to feel the new impulse. It was in 1838 that the Oxford Diocesan Board of Education was formed to improve schools and teachers, Edmund Hobhouse, afterwards Bishop of Nelson, New Zealand, already a close friend of Temple's, being one of its leading spirits, though its youngest member. The Diocesan Training College for masters was opened at Summertown in 1840, Hobhouse being its energetic secretary. It was Edmund Hobhouse who first introduced Temple to the practical work of training teachers. In 1843, Hobhouse, then Fellow of Merton, became Vicar of St. Peter's in the East, Oxford, and there found an orphan, James Jenkin, a lad of great promise, who had been educated in the old Oxford Greycoat School.

¹ Sir W. H. Farrer writes: "The first really great call for education by the public arose after the uprising of the North in 1842, when large areas of Lancashire and West Yorkshire fell into the hands of the mob. . . . The next year (1843) Sir R. Peel, backed by Sir James Graham as Home Secretary, brought in a Bill for general education on the lines of the national (Church) schools. Party opposition was too strong. But the Government pressed its object by means of a general public subscription, headed first by the Queen, and in the second place by Sir R. Peel. The undergraduates of Balliol sent £200 to this subscription."

He wished to make Jenkin into a trained teacher; and asked his friend Temple to give him special instruction in mathematics. This incident has been lately recalled by Mr. Henry Hughes, for many years master of the old Bluecoat Boys' School.¹ Thus, from the very beginning of his life as a Fellow, Temple became interested in teachers and training colleges and elementary education. He was, moreover, much impressed by a report of Tufnell's, showing the hereditary nature of English pauperism; and thus, when Sir James Kay Shuttleworth proposed to the Government to establish district pauper schools and a training college for the masters of such schools, Dr. Temple was asked whether, if the scheme were carried out, he would be the first Principal of the new training college.²

We now return to the other movement alluded to above, that for University reform.³

The following memorandum, which the Rev. Lewis Campbell, M.A., LL.D., has kindly written, will be of interest on this point:—

In the twenty years which followed the Reform Act various currents of influence converged to stimulate opinion in the direction of (1) National Education, and (2) of University Reform. The 'Tractarians themselves were not

¹ The rest of it shall be told in his own words: "Dr. Temple and James Jenkin again met—the one as Metropolitan Bishop, the other as Mayor and Alderman of his native city. In 1882 the Bishop came to preach before the Corporation at Carfax Church; and, as was customary, had to walk beside the Mayor to the church. 'Do you know me, my lord?' asked his Worship. The Bishop replied, 'No, Mr. Mayor, I have not that honour.' 'I am "little James," your pupil.' The recognition was instantaneous; and the Bishop had the double satisfaction of knowing that his early labours had borne fruit, and of realising that he still held a place in the affections of his former scholar."

² For full account of the Educational History see "Memoir of Education Office Period," pp. 120-128.—Ed.

³ For full account see "Memoir of Education Office Period," pp. 115-119.—Ed.

insensible to the fact that the way to the Church through the Universities was barred to the poorer men. Political Radicalism favoured the diffusion of useful knowledge and the education of the people. Christian socialism raised an indignant protest, which found a voice in Kingsley's *Alton Locke*, against the restriction of higher education to the privileged classes. Nonconformist sentiment was divided between the angry claim for admission to the Universities, and the blind prejudices against them as "homes of dead languages and undying prejudice";¹ and at Oxford itself, while professors of science were already agitating for an enlarged curriculum, Archibald Campbell Tait, who had experiences at Glasgow of a National system, and Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, were projecting measures of reform, and had visited Bonn together, in order to study German methods. It was now that the movement of University reform, which had slept for some years, was awakened in good earnest; and Oxford liberalism, with various shades of difference, became a power. Reformers from within the University began to correspond with those who were agitating the question in Parliament. At this crossing of the ways one motive which acted on Temple with considerable force was, undoubtedly, his sympathy with those who, like himself, were hampered in their intellectual development by the stress of poverty. The foundation of the National Society,² the abolition of restriction on college fellowships, the reduction of college expenses, were sure to have his enthusiastic support. Characteristically, as appears in his evidence before the Commission in 1850, he anticipated one change, which long afterwards took effect, by advocating the admission of students who should not reside in college. His own youth had no need of leading strings; and he would gladly have been left more to himself, as A. C. Tait had been at Glasgow. It was in entire keeping with all this that he was one of the first of the Oxford men, including Lingen and Matthew Arnold, whom Sir James Kay Shuttleworth selected to be members of his educational staff; and also that, before succeeding Tait at Rugby, he ruled for a time the experimental training college at Kneller Hall, where he and F. Palgrave were Tennyson's neighbours for a time. The institution of "middle class examinations"³ took place

¹ Mr. John Bright.

² This was founded 1811.

³ Since known as "Local Examinations."

long afterwards ; but Temple's part in that step also was in harmony with his antecedents.

Besides these two great formative influences which Oxford then exerted on his character, the religious and the educational, certainly not less potent, though more difficult to estimate, was the personal influence of his many friends. Few men can have had so many, so varied, and such brilliant friends as Temple had in his Oxford days. He was a delightful companion, and on terms of singularly equal friendship, during these years, with men both older and younger than himself. His frank and generous sociability gave Balliol something of new life. Readers of Ward's *Memoirs* will remember the description of the novel party and dance that Temple, with his mother and sisters, gave in the common-room at Balliol, at which his former tutor, Ward, after some demur, and some doubts as to its propriety, was present, and how Ward himself was exuberant, and "lost his heart to all the charming ladies he met there."

Perhaps the most intimate of his friends was his old schoolfellow, R. Lawson, with whom he corresponded for more than forty years. Few only of the letters survive ; but they are enough to show how close and how stimulating such an equal friendship must have been, and how the habit of corresponding on the highest subjects assists in the formation of tested opinions.

No friendship could have been closer than that with Jowett, during the years of their residence together, as Fellows of Balliol. Readers of Jowett's life will remember the delightful letter that Temple wrote, in July 1854, to F. T. Palgrave, on his walking tour with Jowett in Derbyshire :—

We walked up the Derwent, and down the Dove, and managed to make out a very pleasant tour—discoursed of

every conceivable subject; sometimes "making picture galleries of our friends"—sometimes settling the destinies of the universe, sometimes examining the genuineness of the Pastoral Epistles; most often, I think, comparing the scenery with other we had seen, or trying to recollect all that books of any sort had said about it. The philosopher has only two faults: he walks too slow, and too unevenly; and he prefers tea, and even ginger-beer and biscuits, to more generous meat and drink.

Jowett was elected Fellow along with Woollcombe, Lake, and T. C. Lonsdale, in the same year that Temple with Coleridge and C. E. Moberly were elected Scholars. Professor Lewis Campbell, the biographer of Jowett, writes on April 4, 1903:—

From the time of his becoming a Fellow until he went to be head of Kneller Hall, Temple's intercourse with Jowett was close and constant. Indeed Jowett's relations with all his colleagues, especially with his juniors, until his repulse for the Mastership in 1854, were of the friendliest kind. But with Temple, above all, he had almost perfect intellectual companionship. . . . Their philosophical interests appear to have harmonised. In particular, they were seriously engaged on a joint translation of Hegel's logic, which had made some progress before Temple had left Oxford. . . .¹ Speaking afterwards of Temple's mental attitude in the early fifties, Jowett said to me, "He seemed to me as free as air."

What this friendship must have been to both may be gathered from the dedication of the first edition (June 1855) of Jowett's work on the *Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans*.

¹ As this work proceeded, Temple became less attracted to Hegel, and finally rejected his system, and went back to Kant. Probably he felt with Jowett (*Memoirs*, vol. i. p. 92) that the problem of ἀλήθεια πρακτική—truth idealised and yet in action—Hegel did not seem to have solved. To Kant he was faithful to the end of his life, often basing a sermon on him. As late as January 1902 he gave a lecture of nearly an hour in length on Kant's philosophy in the drawing-room at Canterbury. Both his rejection of Hegel and his fidelity to Kant are thoroughly characteristic.

To

The Reverend FREDERICK TEMPLE, M.A.
 formerly Fellow of Balliol College, Oxford,
 in
 grateful acknowledgment
 of numberless thoughts and suggestions
 and of
 the blessing of a long and never-failing friendship,
 this work
 is affectionately inscribed.

In the second edition (January 1858) of this book is the altered dedication :—

To

The Reverend FREDERICK TEMPLE, D.D.
 Chaplain to the Queen, and Headmaster of Rugby School,
 this work is affectionately inscribed.

It has been thought that this change indicated some alienation between them, but the fact seems certainly to have been that the dedication of the first edition had been used in certain quarters to damage Rugby School and its new Headmaster; for Jowett's volumes were at the time very unfavourably received by the dominant parties in the Church. The friendship and mutual respect of these two men remained unchanged, though their attitudes to some of the greatest problems in life became distinctly different. Jowett came to stay with him at Rugby and at Fulham (indeed at all his homes); and during the Exeter and London periods, the Bishop and Mrs. Temple often visited Balliol. The Bishop preached frequently in Balliol Chapel. No one who was present at the meeting held in London for a Jowett memorial, where Mr. Asquith and Dr. Martineau also spoke, could misconstrue the tone of affection in which Temple proposed a statue that should "recall to us the

very lineaments of our friend." It was he also who read the funeral service at Jowett's grave.

Another of the senior friends at Oxford, to whom he owed much, was Tait, the future Archbishop. Tait was his tutor in logic and philosophy. Temple always spoke of Tait's teaching and kindness, of his hard-headed love of truth, and of his power of weighing movements, with the greatest warmth of expression. On the other hand, he felt that Tait had little power of appreciating the principles of others, when they were not in unison with his own. The strain to which this friendship was for a time subjected, at the time of *Essays and Reviews*, is well known, and needs no comment here.¹

He was in close communication and friendship with Stanley, soon to be the Secretary to the Oxford Commission. In 1881, when Dean Stanley was buried in the Abbey, Dr. Temple was one of his pall-bearers. He was intimate with Scott, his tutor in scholarship, and afterwards Master of Balliol, and Dean of Rochester. He frequently stayed with him in his Rectory of Duloe during vacations, and assisted him in the Lexicon, and in parish work. With Lord Lingen, who was elected Fellow in 1841, and with Lake, afterwards Dean of Durham; with Sir Stafford Northcote, afterwards Lord Iddesleigh, and Lord Farrer, and M. Arnold and Shairp; with Burgon and Hobhouse, and Walrond and Sellar, and W. Rogers and Constantine Prichard, he was on terms of friendship, and intellectual companionship during these plastic years. The paths of this group of men diverged widely on the great ocean of life, and led them into other friendships, and divers forms of work. But the sympathetic and affectionate and

¹ See *Life of Tait*, i. chap. ii., and *Letters of B. Jowett*, i. chaps. ix. and x.

stimulating acquaintance with men so different and so typical, was no small factor in his preparation for the work that lay before him.

And the influence of his family continued. His mother and sisters were living in Oxford, and kept "the spell of home affection" alive. They speak of enjoying his delightful Balliol parties, of sharing in his many interests, of seeing much of his many friends. Charles Moberly, a contemporary scholar of Balliol, there met and became engaged to Temple's elder sister, Catherine. Miss Temple used to speak of the intense interest of these years; and this must have come to her through her brother's affectionate fidelity to his family.

He was then, as always, given to extensive and accurate reading. He adopted Arnold's principle—that the teacher must always be a learner; that "he must give his pupils water from a running stream, and not from a stagnant pool" (an axiom he was never weary of pressing home to the end of his life)—and therefore in mathematics and logic, and in history and law and science and philosophy, and in the many political questions at home and abroad of these exciting years, he was an ardent student, as well as a most successful teacher.¹

In the attempt to reproduce his life at this time, the vacations must not be overlooked. We find

¹ The following story is authentic, as well as characteristic. "Matthew Arnold got leave, at the last moment, to take in Logic for Responsions, instead of Euclid, which he could never master. The day before the examination he went to Jowett, who was his tutor, and asked how he could learn the subject in time, as he was wholly ignorant of it. Jowett said his only chance was to go to Temple, and see if he would try to teach him in one day. Temple consented; and, starting about nine o'clock in the morning, talked continuously, allowing two pauses of half an hour each for meals, till past two o'clock the next morning. Arnold had been provided with paper, but took no notes. He lay back in his chair with the tips of his fingers together, saying, from time to time, 'What wonderful fellows they were!' Soon after two o'clock A.M. Temple sent Arnold away to get some sleep; after which he satisfied the examiners in Logic. He answered every question."

him visiting Holland and Prussia and Switzerland, chiefly with an eye to educational and social questions. He spent some time in Paris, prior to 1848, living in the working quarters of the city, and associating with the working-men on terms of equality. "They took me," he once said, "from my accent, to be some sort of wild beast from the provinces; and I did not undeceive them." He found his way, not without danger, disguised as a workman, into one of the Chartist meetings in London, and at the door his hands were examined to see if he were a workman indeed. They were hard enough to pass.

Mr. Charles S. Roundell writes (1903) an interesting letter of which, however, space only allows selections to be made :—

I have a very vivid recollection of Frederick Temple, who, when I went up to Balliol in 1846, was a Fellow and Tutor, of three or four years' standing. But, at the same time, I find it difficult to record anything beyond a general appreciation of him. I can say but little as to his particular attitude towards the Church movement. Though perfectly candid and open-minded and single-minded, with no disposition towards tortuousness of mind, or concealment of his real thoughts, it was not his way to discuss matters of theology. As has been said of him, "He did not open the doors and windows of his mind to all the breezes, but let them blow by, while he minded his work."¹ His attitude towards the speculations of the day is perhaps best shown by his contribution to the volume of *Essays and Reviews*—an essay essentially orthodox, though one of a suspect series. Of his attitude towards questions of a public nature it is easier to speak. As an instance of his thoroughness and outspokenness in questions of this sort may be taken his evidence before the Oxford University Commission, his justification of the right of interference with Founders' Wills, and his declaration that "of all the reforms to be made at Oxford, this appears to me the vital one. Without a thorough reform here, all other reforms are as likely as

¹ Cf. Editor's Supplement, vol. ii. pp. 434-437.—Ed.

not to be mischievous." His was essentially a practical mind, of a very high order, not given to theological or metaphysical subtleties.¹ Perhaps the most distinctive feature of his character was his transparent piety, and also his strong affectionateness of disposition. In politics he was a staunch Liberal.²

He was a strenuous supporter of the movement for University Reform; and, as is well known, his was the mind and voice which had predominant influence in the Royal Commission for Inquiry into the Endowed Schools. It was said of him by Lord John Russell, a few years later, that he was a Cabinet Minister spoiled. Certainly that was the impression which he produced upon his juniors. We had the impression of great lucidity of mind, of an eager interest in all matters of discussion, of a firm grasp of subjects, of a great power of work, of a power of effective, if rough, expression; and above all, we had a sense of latent honesty, apart from all thought of self, which added much force to all he said and did. Speaking for myself, to the latest period of his life when he was Archbishop, I found him the same simple, kind, true friend whom I had known in Balliol days.

CHARLES S. ROUNDELL.

Sir W. J. Farrer writes on June 4, 1903, in a letter covering the reminiscences that follow:—

I send a few notes on my early and deeply respected friend the late Archbishop. I would they were more thorough, and more complete. As a matter of fact, I myself took part a good deal in the common sports of the College—cricket, boating, etc.—so that an occasional walk or breakfast were the only occasions on which we came together.

In later life each of us had his own full work in his own line, and those lines were laid in different spheres. When, some years ago, I gave up the burden of my profession, and should have been glad to discuss questions of larger importance, he was too full of duties to allow me to think of intruding. To me the way in which he went about—in spite of the infirmity of sight—teaching, preaching, and doing good, was a marvel. Inspired itself, it inspired others.—
Yours very truly, W. J. FARRER.

¹ Cf. Editor's Supplement, vol. ii. pp. 434-435.—Ed.

² He was on Gladstone's Committee in the Oxford election for 1846.

REMINISCENCES FROM SIR W. J. FARRER

18 UPPER BROOK STREET,
May 12, 1903.

I fear my reminiscences of F. Temple, late Archbishop of Canterbury, at the time when I went up to Balliol College, are scanty. Still, such as they are, they are at your service.

I went up in October 1840, and remained there the usual three years, till December 1843. He had preceded me by a year, having gone up in 1839.

A few words upon his personal appearance may have their interest.

Somewhat above the middle height, he was very strongly built; with open chest and upright bearing, his gait as well as his countenance denoted unusual vigour. The latter was a broad oval, with high cheek-bones, and a complexion which, while ruddy, was yet tinged with a darker hue that seemed to show southern blood. His face was frank and open; his eyes a dark hazel, of which the expression, keen and penetrating as it could be, spoke ordinarily both of kindness and fun. His hair was dark, straight, and long. The whole outlook, without whiskers, was in a measure that of a very well-grown boy—full of good-humour, frankness, strength, and intelligence. It was one to inspire confidence.

He was my senior by two or perhaps three terms, but had not become much known; nor were his great powers generally recognised.

He had come up on the Blundell foundation from Tiverton Grammar School, holding a scholarship, good in point of emolument. But the school itself held no very high position, and its foundationers generally were perhaps hardly up to the general standard in the college. The result was that young men from thence were not welcomed, as matters of course, until they had proved their personal qualities. These, in the case of Temple, had, by the time of my arrival, begun to make themselves felt, though not even then to the extent they deserved.

He was a good walker—in fact, it was in this way he took exercise. He avoided the general society of the college, its sports, and amusements, and stuck pretty closely to his rooms and work. All this for the best of reasons, as I shall show in a minute; but, as a fact, it kept him from much of the intimate personal intercourse which was usual among men of the same college.

After a while the cause of the abstention became known ; we got to know that his life was abstemious and self-denying to a degree—we got to know that he never, however cold the weather, indulged in a fire ; never drank wine ; and we got to know the cause—that his father had died, leaving a widow and family with very scanty provision ; and that he was endeavouring to live upon his scholarship without trenching on his mother's means—nay, more, that he was seeking out of his scholarship income (considerable though it was as a help, yet but very scanty as a sole provision for living) to help his mother with the education of her younger children.

I need not say how this worked in the college ; everybody, Fellows and undergraduates, were proud to seek the friendship of one of such character and energy.

It was then the custom for a young man to read with a private tutor (technically “a coach”) before going in for high University honours ; and the better the young man's means the longer could he afford this special training. Temple, of course, could not afford it in any degree, and the tutors of the college were glad to give him all the help they could, beyond that which lay in the ordinary course of their tutorial duties.

The result was that Temple came out in Easter term, 1842, as a Double First—both in Classics and Mathematics, the highest attainable degree ; and I do not think I ever remember any one whose success in the schools gave greater general satisfaction.

Be it remembered that at that time all subjects were taken at the same time in the Final Schools. There was no second year (moderations) examination—Divinity, Logic, Philosophy, History, and Scholarship were the subjects for one week, and within two or three weeks followed the mathematical examination.

One other phase of his Oxford life is very present to my memory ; he took, as private tutor (coach), a reading-party to Dolgelly, in North Wales. C. Prichard took another party to Maentwrog (in the Vale of Efestiniog). I was one of the latter party.

Since the members of the two parties were all very intimate, we paid each other visits ; they, on the day we walked over, had a steeple-chase in the evening up Cader Idris, and the following day, tub-swimming down the river. I don't think Temple actually joined in the steeple-chase, or

in the attempted tub race, but he enjoyed the fun as much as anybody, and the fun was great.

He came at a later time to the Education Office in London. At that period I had a good deal of work at the Privy Council, and at times looked in on old Balliol friends then working there. One day after a gossip—"Well, Farrer," he said, "the country pays me so much an hour for my work, and I'm bound to do it,"—a trifle, but suggestive.

The foregoing notes will show indications in those early days of the character which afterwards was so markedly developed. It seemed to me then, and indeed the remark holds good throughout his life, that his high qualities were rather those of the active practical man of the world, than of the Student or Philosopher. Had his *métier* been the army, he would have been first-rate as the Commanding Officer and Administrator, and perhaps such a life might even have been very congenial. But it must be remembered that his undergraduate life coincided with the rise and vigour of the Oxford High Church movement. Led by J. H. Newman, at that time occupying the pulpit of St. Mary's, its influence over the young, thoughtful, and able men of the day was extraordinary. It fairly carried all before it for a time. It affected many, who, ere long, entirely threw aside its modes of thought and action. The Church was everything—a clergyman's life the highest, etc., etc. I fancy that I still trace this influence in the way in which, in his essay on "The Education of the World" (*Essays and Reviews*), F. Temple deals with some of the dogmatic utterances of the early Church. Of these some were mistakes or have become obsolete; but he lays stress on the importance of the truths which it then laid down, and which still remain. It may be only my own idea, but I think in later days he would have looked upon these utterances, not so much as Eternal Truths, of which the utterance was the utterance of Inspiration, as rules by which the Church was to be guided.

Finally, the interesting letter from Dr. Hornby, the Provost of Eton, must be given entire—

ETON COLLEGE,
May 21, 1903.

DEAR ARCHDEACON WILSON—I have a vivid recollection of F. Temple, as I saw him in my undergraduate days at

Balliol^o; but I find it very difficult, at this distance of time, to recall special incidents which are likely to be of interest, still more to give any satisfactory answer to your questions about his relations to leading men or schools of thought in the Oxford of that day. I was never on such terms of intimacy as to receive any direct disclosures on these points. All I can do is to describe the impressions which we undergraduates received from what we could notice of his habits, pursuits, and friendships; or could gather from his general conversation in such intercourse as we had with him, or from stories which were current in the college.

I distinctly remember my first meeting with him. It was in November 1844, when I, with two or three other Etonians, had come up to Oxford to try for a Balliol Scholarship. I was standing just inside the gate of Balliol with John Coleridge Patteson, the future bishop, when Temple came in. He stopped at once, and began to talk to us in a cheery way. He of course knew nothing of us, except that we were evidently boys up from school; and we only knew that he was one of the Balliol dons. I remember that we asked his name of the porter, and agreed in hoping that when we came up we might be his pupils. This hope was not destined to be realised; but we were brought into contact with him from the beginning of our residence, and both of us received much kindness from him. On coming up to Balliol next year, we were placed in a large Euclid Lecture presided over by Temple, in the College Hall, including, I think, all the freshmen, except a few who were capable of better things, as being more advanced in mathematics. It was very like a school lesson. We had to learn a certain number of propositions, and then were put on at random to prove them. Under most men this would have been dull enough. But Temple kept us alert, walking briskly about the Hall, talking very loud, turning suddenly upon us with questions, and greeting blunders with boisterous laughter. He seemed to be always in high spirits, as though the whole thing were very enjoyable. At the same time he exacted work, showing marked displeasure at any neglect or idleness, and using great plainness of speech.

Shortly afterwards, in my second term, I think, I was put into a Lucretius Lecture with him, the only classical lecture, I believe, which he ever took at college. It was in the days before Monro's or even Lachmann's editions had appeared, and such notes as we had were very poor. Temple was not

interested in minute points of scholarship, and so far as the lecture was a lesson in construing, it was not effective—nor so good as we should have had at Eton. But when from time to time he stopped the construing to gather up the argument and to talk about the philosophy, he was quite in his element, and very interesting and instructive.¹

But his great service as a lecturer (at least to us who were on the classical side) came to us through his admirable lectures on Logic. They were far the best lectures on the subject which I have ever heard, and proved the most helpful ultimately in the schools, and this though I missed a good deal from being put into the lectures too soon, when I had not read enough Logic to take full advantage of the teaching, and found some parts of it beyond me. But the arrangement was so good, and the language so clear and definite, that it was possible, even for a beginner, to take notes pretty fully. There was a noticeable peculiarity in his delivery. After going on rather rapidly for five or ten minutes, he would pause and reflect a moment, and then say, as if to himself, but quite aloud, "Yes"; the "Yes" seeming to mean "That is what I meant to say," "All right so far." Then he would start afresh. The lectures had been prepared with great care. I believe that he had given much work in term time, and several vacations, to making a full study of the subject, after his taking his degree. He had the Aristotelian Logic at his finger-ends, and he seemed to have read a great deal of the Scholastic Logic at first hand. Certainly, he criticised and corrected the ordinary manuals with great vigour and clearness, making havoc of Aldrich and Whateley, and showing how their interpretations of many common scholastic terms were mere guesses, more or less ingenious, but not true historically to the usage of the schoolmen, and thus involving, not unfrequently, absurdities and contradictions. He introduced us to Kant; and, going beyond the borders of Logic, he gave some very interesting lectures on Comte and the *Positive Philosophy*. He did not meddle with Hegel, whose time at Oxford had not yet come. Some very good notes of Temple's lectures taken by a senior man (I think William Bastard) were passed from hand to hand in my time. I do not know whether any record of the

¹ This was precisely the experience of the Sixth Form at Rugby, in Dr. Temple's first half-year (1858), when doing Lucretius with him.—ED.

lectures* still exists in Temple's papers or elsewhere. They would perhaps be out of date in the Oxford course as it is now; but so far as the old Logic is still in vogue, they would be very instructive.

And there was another service which he rendered to many of us, of a different kind. On the evening before the administration of the Holy Communion, which took place once a month, he used to invite to his rooms any of the undergraduates who chose to come, to hear a short address. The room, a moderate-sized lecture-room, was generally full. The addresses, which he read, were of a devotional character—never controversial—simple, earnest, affectionate, full of sympathy with young men in their trials and difficulties, sometimes delivered with marked emotion. They were the only addresses,¹ I think, of the kind in Balliol, at that time, and they were much appreciated.

Balliol was at that time under Dr. Jenkyns—the old master as he was commonly called, a very shrewd man, with a good deal of insight into character, commonly disguised under an appearance of senile simplicity and singularity, from behind which, as a kind of veil, he used to watch his young friends when off their guard. This made it often difficult to know whether his likes and dislikes were real or assumed. One of these was his dislike of the Blundell Scholars from Tiverton School. The Master had succeeded in throwing open all the other scholarships, and was believed to resent his inability to touch the close Blundell foundation. Temple was a Blundell Scholar, and the Master is said to have always brought this up as a term of disparagement (probably playful) whenever any attempt was made by Tait or others to bring forward Temple's merits and promise. The disparagement is said to have been maintained even after Temple had gained a Double First. It only gave way when he was elected a Fellow. However this may have been, it had passed before my time into a warm feeling of regard and a hearty friendship.

Of the other college authorities under whom Temple came, the most remarkable were Tait and W. G. Ward. With Tait he had a lifelong friendship, broken only by a rather serious estrangement during the controversy about *Essays and Reviews*, which, however, before long, gave way to a complete revival of the old cordiality and confidence.

¹This is questioned by some correspondents.

Even when the estrangement was at its height, there was a very feeling acknowledgment by Temple (in an otherwise severe letter) of the great debt which he owed to Tait, and of his deep sense of Tait's kindness (*Life of Archbishop Tait*, vol. i. p. 300). I believe that in the days of Temple's great poverty as an undergraduate, Tait, more than any one else, supplied the private tuition, out of lecture hours, which others commonly purchased from "coaches." It used to be said at Balliol (I know not with what degree of truth) that Temple was the only man who had ever got a Double First without the help of a coach. As to Ward, who, I suppose, was Temple's chief teacher in mathematics, and who had left Balliol shortly before my time, I can hardly recollect to have heard anything from Temple (who always mentioned him affectionately), apart from the ludicrous side of his character. Balliol was full of stories of Ward's verbal encounters with his brother Fellows (especially with Tait), of his irresistible skill in argument, of his generosity and kindness of heart, of his strange eccentricities, of the affection in which he was held by all, and of the practical jokes to which, notwithstanding such affection, he was constantly subjected by undergraduates. Temple had in memory a score of these, which any talk about Ward would commonly evoke; how, for instance, Ward would post up a notice in the morning that he was too ill to lecture, and presently would be heard shouting on the staircase to his scout, "Herbert, beefsteaks and porter at eleven"; how on Wednesday mornings he would always keep an hour free from lectures, so as to have the first reading of *Punch* at the Union; and how an undergraduate who devoted himself to this, would take care to anticipate Ward so as to seize on both copies of *Punch* (all that the Union then provided), and would then sit upon one copy and read the other all the time that Ward was in the room.

Of his other friends, I think the most intimate were Jowett, Clough, J. C. Shairp, Constantine Prichard, and Matthew Arnold, and, of the undergraduates, Theodore Walrond and Francis Palgrave, several of whom I met for the first time in Temple's rooms. He was very kind and hospitable to us freshmen; and soon after I went up, J. C. Patteson, Edward Arnold, and I were invited to dine with him in the common-room; I there saw Clough for the first time, and was very much struck by his bright look, manner, and conversation, and, as I well remember, rather shocked

Edward Arnold by asking, "Who is that clever fellow opposite?" "Why, Clough, of course," he replied; "I thought that every one knew Clough," as no doubt all Rugbeians did, though we Etonians were in the dark. I afterwards met Matthew Arnold, J. C. Shairp, and Constantine Prichard, under similar circumstances, as the guests of either Temple or Jowett. All these (except the two undergraduates and Shairp), as well as Temple himself, are admirably described by Shairp in his poem, "Balliol Scholars: a remembrance."

I wish I could say anything definite or trustworthy as to Temple's relation to the Church parties of the day at Oxford. When I went up Newman had disappeared, leaving, of course, a deep impression, and being the subject of innumerable stories and much discussion. In the eyes of us undergraduates, Temple was an anti-Newmanite, a follower and intimate friend of Jowett. But even then we could see a difference between them—Jowett, I think, was never attracted by Newman, and never spoke of him with any admiration. But Temple, like his friend J. C. Shairp, was believed to have been strongly drawn to Newman, chiefly, I suppose, through the famous Parochial Sermons, not as a follower of the Church system¹ with which Newman's name is connected, but as a warm admirer of the man, and as finding in the sermons, as Shairp did, something much greater than the system which they were supposed to advocate. In truth, such advocacy was not a leading feature in them. "Those who had never heard Newman," says Shairp,² "might fancy that his sermons would generally be about Apostolical Succession, or rights of the Church, or against Dissenters. Nothing of the kind. You might hear him preach for weeks without an allusion to these things. What there was of High Church teaching was implied rather than enforced. . . . After hearing these sermons you might come away, still not believing the tenets peculiar to the High Church system; but you would be harder than most men if you did not feel more than ever ashamed of coarseness, selfishness, worldliness; if you did not feel the things of faith brought closer to the soul."

I do not know whether it is fanciful to think that Temple's addresses on the evenings before the Holy Com-

¹ See Editor's Supplement, vol. ii. pp. 444-446.—Ed.

² Shairp's *Studies in Poetry and Philosophy* (Keble), pp. 248-249, 4th edition, 1886.

munion owed something to Newman's influence. Though he never touched on controversy, his treatment of the subject and his manner gave us something which we should not have got from Jowett. There was something, I think, of the tone of the famous sermons, though without their singular beauty of language.

I saw very little of Temple in later life, but from all that one heard of him his early characteristics underwent little change. His earnestness, his immense industry, his frank and hearty manner, his sincerity and singleness of purpose were the same. His roughness, of which so much has been said, seems to me to have been sometimes exaggerated into a rudeness, from which I think he was free. He was rough in the sense of being plain-spoken, downright, rather brusque, not given to mince phrases. But he was never ill-natured, nor, I think, inconsiderate, except in the sense that not being thin-skinned himself, he did not expect any great sensitiveness in others. He was wholly free from that which, I think, young men most dislike and fear—a cynical or satirical tone. Where this is absent they do not resent the use of plain language. Certainly he was very popular, as well as universally respected. We used to hear many stories, perhaps in some cases exaggerated, of what he had gone through owing to his narrow circumstances in his undergraduate days. Stories of the scanty and sometimes insufficient fare on which he managed to live; of his habit of reading by the light of the lamp on the staircase-landing to save the expense of candles in his own room; of his inability, to which I have alluded above, to get any help from “coaches” in his reading for double Honours; of his refusal to partake in the ordinary course of hospitalities which he was unable to return; and how, with all this, his honesty and self-respect, and the frankness and cheeriness of his manner, won him general popularity, and led to the formation of many lasting friendships with the best men in the college. At any rate, we younger men who heard these things by report, and could see for ourselves something of his simple, earnest, industrious, and conscientious life, felt that we had come across a man of very noble character, whom it was a privilege to know.—Believe me, yours very truly,

J. J. HORNBY.

This must conclude the sketch of Temple's early life and circumstances and training, and of the

place he held in the judgment of his contemporaries.¹ It is the privilege of other writers of these memoirs to show how nobly the promise of these years was fulfilled.

¹ For a supplementary account of the influence of the Oxford period, see Editor's Supplement, vol. ii. chap. i. "Development," p. 403.

**MEMOIR OF THE EDUCATION
OFFICE PERIOD**

1848—1857

By HENRY J. ROBY, M.A., Hon. LL.D.

CHAPTER I

EMPLOYMENT UNDER COMMITTEE OF COUNCIL.

Examiner in the Education Office—Principal of Kneller Hall—
Letter of a former student of Kneller Hall—Domestic life
at Kneller Hall—Inspector of Training Colleges.

FROM May 1, 1848, to the end of 1857 Mr. Temple was in the public service, attached to the department of the Committee of Council on Education: first, to the end of 1849, as Examiner in the office; then as Principal of Kneller Hall Training College till the end of 1855; and, lastly, as Inspector, chiefly of Training Schools, till he became Headmaster of Rugby.¹

An Examiner in the Education Office, besides revising the marks given by the Inspectors to candidates for certificates, in order to ensure uniformity of standard, had other functions similar to those of an assistant secretary: he had to consider the reports of Inspectors and the information given by the Managers of Schools, and ascertain whether the rules of the department allowed a grant of public money to aid the elementary or training school, whether for building or maintenance. The system of administering the grant of money annually voted by Parlia-

¹ Popular Educ. Com. 1861, vol. vi. Q. 2456. In 1855 he was appointed Examiner with Sir James Stephen in English History, Literature, and Composition for the first Indian Civil Service Examination.

ment necessarily involved a multitude of details. Parliament intended only to aid voluntary effort, and the expenditure of the grant was in the hands of the local managers of the particular schools; but the central office had to guard against misapplications, and to act with impartiality in all parts of the country, and under the watchful and suspicious eyes of rival religious denominations. "Connected with these details are a great variety of questions on which people's feelings and animosities are very easily excited, and you require in this work, which looks so petty, a great deal of administrative discretion. An intemperate letter written to the manager of some little out-of-the-way school may produce a commotion in a diocese. Any act of partiality as between one set of promoters and another might produce very serious consequences. You have a certain amount of really responsible action entangled in a vast mass of complicated minute detail."¹ When Mr. Temple was an examiner, the Secretary was Sir James Kay Shuttleworth till the end of 1848, and Mr. Lingen (who had been a Fellow of Balliol with Mr. Temple) was an examiner also, and on Sir James Shuttleworth's illness was appointed as his *locum tenens* till the end of 1849, and afterwards made Secretary in his place.

During the time of Mr. Temple's Examinership, Kneller Hall was being built, and it was with the intention of making him Principal that the Committee of Council, in the latter part of 1847, on Sir J. P. Kay Shuttleworth's advice, invited him to leave Oxford and give his services to their Department. We may assume that they consulted him on the arrangements for the future administration of Kneller Hall.

¹ Mr. (afterwards Lord) Lingen. • Pop. Educ. Com. vol. vi. A. 561-563.

In the financial arrangements of Sir Robert Peel's Government in 1846, the Estimates of the Poor Law Commissioners included £30,000 for the salaries of the school masters and mistresses of Workhouses, and Sir Robert proposed that the grant should be used for the improvement of Workhouse schools, while leaving the appointment of the masters in the hands of the Boards of Guardians. On coming into office Lord John Russell's Government at once took up this matter. The Home Secretary, Sir George Grey, requested Sir J. P. Kay Shuttleworth to prepare a memorandum on the administration of this grant. The memorandum, dated August 5, 1846, describes Workhouse schools as wretchedly supplied with books and apparatus, and the masters as having often been themselves dependent on parochial relief and generally ignorant and unskilled.¹ Sir James proposed that benefit from the grant should be obtained only on a better position and more conveniences being secured to the schoolmaster, and should be graduated according to his efficiency; that for the supply of masters for pauper children a training college should be established, and that special inspectors under the Committee of Council should report regularly on the schools. Great stress was laid on the importance of eventually removing the education of the children from the workhouse itself and educating them in district schools. The principles of the memorandum were adopted by a minute of December 21, 1846; and five inspectors of pauper schools were appointed by the Lord President (Lord Lansdowne). In September 1847 an estate called Kneller Hall,² containing fifty acres, between Twickenham and

¹ Minutes of Com. of Council, 1847-48-49, Schools of Paroch. Unions, p. 5.

² It was once the residence of Sir Godfrey Kneller, the painter.

Whitton, was purchased as a site for the training school, and the mansion-house on the estate was rebuilt and enlarged, fitted, and furnished at a cost (including the purchase) of nearly £40,000. On January 7, 1850, the buildings being nearly ready for the reception of students, the Committee of Council passed a minute containing the regulations for the institution. Each student was to pay £30 (very shortly reduced to £25) a year, but twenty-one exhibitions of from £20 to £30 each were provided for the first year for the candidates best qualified according to examination. For the second year they were eligible, as in other training schools, for Queen's scholarships. The accommodation was intended for a Principal, Vice-Principal, two masters, and 100 students.¹

Mr. Temple as Principal was assisted by an old Balliol pupil as Vice-Principal, viz. Francis Turner Palgrave, Esq., B.A., Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford. The salary of the former was £800 a year, of the latter £500. On July 3, 1851, when the training school had been in operation for a year and a half, the Principal drew up a memorandum for the Committee of Council describing fully the routine of the students' daily life, the distribution of the subjects of instruction among the four teachers, and the rules of discipline. The subjects of instruction were divinity (taught by the Principal), geography, English history and literature, grammar, mathematics, physics, agricultural chemistry, and music. The teaching had been entirely oral, text-books being used only as a framework for the lecturer, and the students being required to take copious notes.

The students at their first admission are not in a condition to prepare their own lessons by reading. They require the

¹ Minutes for 1848-49-50, p. 7.

contact of mind with mind, the living presence of the lecturer, the perpetual commentary supplied by voice and gesture, and the slight but constant adaptation of each step in the course to the state of their own knowledge.

But this was only for the first year and a half from admission ; after that the Principal purposed accustoming his students to read for themselves, and subordinating lectures to books.

The Church Service was used on Sundays, the Principal acting as chaplain. The Divinity Course, taken every day before breakfast, was begun by accurate study of one gospel, St. Matthew being almost got by heart. The Acts of the Apostles was next read, and then the Old Testament was commenced, the historical books being read in order, and the prophetic writings being read simultaneously with the contemporaneous history. On alternate days the history of the Church was the subject of lectures, and was to be followed by the study of the Church formularies and Catechism.¹ On Sunday evening St. Paul's Epistles were read in chronological order.

The industrial training of the students was conducted under the guidance of the gardener. The Principal generally joined in their labours in order that what he deemed an essential part of the system might not be undervalued. Mr. Moseley, the Inspector, speaks of seeing on some occasions the whole of the students working in a gang at spade husbandry, with the Principal in his shirt-sleeves at their head. The field-work occupied fully two hours every afternoon. The care of a horse and cow was taken by the students weekly in turns.²

¹ Minutes as above, pp. 6, 8.

² Mr. H. Lee Warner tells a story that on one occasion one of the students at Kneller Hall objected to have to clean out a pig-sty. "Am I forced to do such dirty work?" he asked. Mr. Temple replied slowly, "Well, I suppose not: give me the broom." There was something in his eye which made the young man hesitate, but he handed it; and only

Order and discipline was maintained by appointing captains of each bedroom, who also presided at meals and collected exercises. The students were left a good deal to themselves, and always treated with confidence. No opportunity was ever taken to watch them without their own knowledge. Reliance was placed on constant personal intercourse of teachers with students in their daily life, by sharing their meals and joining in out-of-door employments and recreations.¹

A practising school was established after the first year by getting children from the neighbouring village to come to the college. They were taught in the morning, they joined in the field-work in the afternoon, and came again to lessons in the evening. They were twenty-four in number, were divided into three classes, the Principal taking each class once a week, the other teachers and students taking them at other times. Mr. Temple spoke of the arrangement being quite successful so far as the children were concerned: they enjoyed the field-work, were never tired of lessons, came readily, and were fond of their teachers. But as a practising school it was not large enough to give the students full opportunity of learning the art of teaching. Nor could such a school place before them a complete specimen of their own future labours: it was not composed of pauper children, and a Workhouse school differs in many ways from ordinary schools. To make the system perfect a pauper school of considerable size² was, in Mr. Temple's opinion, indispensable. Lectures on

when he saw his Principal taking off his coat did he cry out, "Oh, sir! I did not mean that." "Some one must do it," said the future Archbishop, and began to clean out the sty in a manner which showed he was no novice. But the student surrendered at discretion.

¹ Minutes as above, p. 10.

² Not less than 200 children—Dr. Temple's answer to Pop. Educ. Com. Q. 2871.

methods of teaching were given to the college students twice a week by the Principal.

Mr. Temple concludes the memorandum from which the above account is taken by remarking that the wide extent of subjects covered by the examination for certificates of merit helped to exaggerate in the minds of the students the importance of knowledge compared with mental cultivation, and that it would be well to confine the examination, especially in all literary parts, to definite text-books. What such students required more than knowledge was refinement and strength of character, next to religious temper and moral principles, and this could be produced only by contact with a cultivated mind, superior not so much in knowledge as in moral qualities and mental discipline.¹

The number of students at Kneller Hall was for the first quarter only five, but grew to forty-six by April 1852, *i.e.* in two and a quarter years. All except four held exhibitions, and almost all had been pupil-teachers, chiefly in the home district.

The Principal had the control of the whole establishment, and signed quarterly accounts published in the Committee of Council's minutes. The payment by the Government on Kneller Hall account in 1852-53 was between £400 and £500 per quarter, besides the salaries.² The total cost was considerably over £50 a year per student.³

Kneller Hall was continued as a Government training school for Workhouse schoolmasters till the end of the year 1855. But the difficulties under which it laboured from its start were not removed, and as time went on were felt more acutely. The want of an adequate practising

¹ Minutes as above, pp. 12, 13 (abridged). .

² Minutes, 1852-53, p. 31 foll. .

³ Dr. Temple's answer to Pop. Educ. Com. Evidence, Q. 2905. .

school of their own, which could be adapted to the training of men who were to have charge of pauper schools, is referred to in Mr. Temple's memorandum. Another difficulty, anticipated from the first, became more sensible as students left Kneller Hall and took places as Workhouse schoolmasters. While the education of the boys was conducted in the Workhouse, the schoolmaster was often treated with little consideration by the uneducated master of the Workhouse, his discipline was destroyed by the master's interference and the demoralised society around them, his time almost wholly occupied with the care of the boys' persons and rooms as well as with their teaching, his salary utterly inadequate to his qualifications, and often reduced by his very success in placing the boys out. The plan originated by Sir James Kay Shuttleworth, and adopted by the Government, contemplated the establishment of schools for the pauper children of a considerable district, under separate management and not in contact with the workhouses. But the Committee of Council had no power to compel the erection of such schools; the Boards of Guardians resisted it simply by doing nothing; and the result was that very few such schools, six or seven only, were erected. Mr. Temple, after quoting from the correspondence of some of his former pupils, says :—

A Workhouse school differs from another especially in this, that the master has to discharge duties which properly belong to the parents, and commonly to the mother, *e.g.* to see them washed and combed, to attend them at meals, to see them go to bed and get up, to teach the boys bed-making and scrubbing, and to assist them in these operations. Some of these duties ought not to be imposed on schoolmasters, but those which ought cannot be done without some experience. Men who have never had to do these things find themselves much at a loss, and, what is still worse, look upon such occupations as menial (for with that rank custom

is everything) and feel degraded. They would feel nothing of the sort if they were called upon to do only what they have been accustomed to do here.

But the want of a practising school is, says H.M. Inspector,¹ nothing in comparison with the want of a proper outlet. A student, in whose zeal and good sense Mr. Temple had the fullest confidence, and who holds a certificate of merit of the first class, writes to one of the students whom he had known :—

Many at Kneller Hall who cannot bear the idea of a Workhouse would work, and work heartily, in a district school ; but seeing no sign of the schools being built, and consequently knowing that, except by accident, they must spend a great part of their lives in a Union, they have allowed a spirit of carelessness to grow up which has told much upon the certificates.

Mr. Temple proceeds :—

No one who knows anything of teaching will be surprised that this discontent should show itself in many unexpected ways—in waste, in carelessness, in disorderliness, in breach of rules. The lever by which a teacher can move his school is taken out of my hands. I am looked on as the representative of the Government which has treated them with injustice. To myself personally they are attached, but the institution is looked upon as a snare. They will neither read heartily nor work heartily. . . . That is not all. Were the students sure of places when fit for them, or were the pauper schools reserved for them as they are for the pauper schools, there would be some justice in the arrangement, but it is hard to be forced into uncomfortable places and not even sure of them. As it is, they are only sure of places which are too uncomfortable to be given away by private interests.

The Inspector, commenting on these statements, admits their accuracy, but points out that the faults do not apply equally to all workhouses, that

¹ Mr. T. B. Browne, who in his General Report for 1855 reproduces Mr. Temple's remarks contained in Prof. Moseley's Report on Kneller Hall in 1855. Minutes, 1855, p. 95. *

they admit of remedy, and that there would be dangers in the establishment of large district schools. This, however, does not now concern us. In the then circumstances Mr. Temple's task appeared hopeless to others as well as to himself. His letters to an intimate friend during this period show the anxiety he felt from the uncertainty of the continuance of Kneller Hall. Both the Governments of Lord Derby and Lord Aberdeen appear to have been undecided in this matter, and the Crimean War was thought to have caused some difficulty even with the small expenditure necessary for this purpose. In June 1853 he proposed to resign. In January 1854 he says: "How much this suspense and anxiety tells upon me I cannot express. I do not think I have been quite free from palpitation of the heart for one hour for the last six months." In October 1854 he wrote that he saw various symptoms of a collapse, and that not only as to Kneller Hall, but as to the whole Education Office. In May 1855 he resigned his place, and a minute was passed by the Lords of the Committee on Education on May 12, 1855, of which the principal part may be quoted:—

Their Lordships considered several representations from the Principal of Kneller Hall, extending from 1852 to the present time, to the effect that the objects of the minute of December 21, 1846, had been only in part accomplished, and that without the addition of schools for practice on the Kneller Hall estate, and without the multiplication of district schools of Unions (pursuant to the Acts 7 and 8 Vict. c. 101 and 11 and 12 Vict. c. 82) throughout the country, no results could be anticipated from the establishment sufficient to justify the expenditure thereon.

Their Lordships found that the position and remunerations of teachers in Workhouse schools, as at present constituted, continue to be such as will not induce well-qualified candidates to prepare themselves, by training, for those appointments; and that in proportion as the condition

of such schools approximates to the general standard, the means of training teachers have been so greatly increased by voluntary efforts (assisted by the Government) since 1847 as to render it less necessary for the Committee of Council to continue to make special provision for this purpose. Their Lordships adverted to the fact that it had formed no part of the measures of the Committee, in establishing Kneller Hall, to bring that establishment into competition with other training schools under inspection.

Under these circumstances, their Lordships considered it advisable that the Training School on the Kneller Hall estate should not be maintained after December 31, 1855. . . .

Their Lordships unanimously determined to place on record their regret that the discontinuance of Kneller Hall as a training school would remove the Principal, the Rev. Frederick Temple, from a post for which he was eminently fitted, and in which throughout the period of his employment he had continued to deserve the entire confidence and approbation of their Lordships by devotion and ability in the discharge of his duties, and by candour and disinterestedness in all his communications with the Committee of Council.¹

Mr. (afterwards Lord) Lingen, in giving a testimonial to accompany Mr. Temple's application for the Headmastership of Rugby, refers to this minute, and says that it puts Mr. Temple's position in the true light :—

The discontinuance of Kneller Hall was a simple and necessary consequence of the resolution of the Government to abandon the other portions of their plan; and Mr. Temple personally had no more to do with the reasons upon which that resolution was founded than if he had been a military officer withdrawn from a position which his general had at one time intended to include within his lines, and to occupy in force, but had afterwards determined to neglect. Knowing as I do with what motives and with what anticipations Mr. Temple had devoted himself to a duty from which most persons at the time were disposed to dissuade him, and how he bore himself during six years of the most trying

¹ Minutes (Schools of Parochial Unions), 1853, p. 5.

suspense, I can only say that no amount of success under the conditions originally proposed to him, but never accomplished, would have impressed me with a deeper conviction of his ability, or with an equal conviction of his moral strength.

It will be seen that this minute of the Committee of Council hints at another difficulty experienced by Kneller Hall. It was attacked vehemently and persistently by the denominational parties as a rival training college maintained by the Government. The fact that a chaplain of the Church of England was by the Regulations made part of the staff, if the Principal was not a clergyman, and that the religious instruction and divine service were those of the Church,¹ might, it would seem, have been sufficient security to the Church party; and that there was no other existing training school which proposed to itself even as a collateral object the training of pauper and prison schoolmasters² might have protected it from jealousy on the part of those with whose work it did not interfere. There was, of course, a conscience clause in favour of students who required it. In a letter of December 1852, Mr. Temple says only four dissenters had come there, and that they had all gone away churchmen.

Of the students trained at Kneller Hall the majority went to the Workhouse schools, feeling it to be their duty to do so. But when Kneller Hall was given up, this moral compulsion was withdrawn, and they have since entered National and other schools. Some went to schools in the Colonies and succeeded fairly well; those who went to the few district pauper schools succeeded extremely well.³

¹ Minutes, 1848-49-50, p. 14.

² Mr. Moseley's Report, Minutes, 1850-51-52, p. 24.

³ Dr. Temple's answer to Pop. Ed. Com. Q. 2899-2901.

One of the Kneller Hall pupils has sent for the purposes of this memoir a letter which is so interesting that it seems best to give it in full exactly as written :—

During the years 1854-56, for upwards of two years, I was at Kneller Hall. Mr. Temple—for he had not then become D.D.—had under him about eighty students. We were a lot of raw youths, but of good average material, coming from all parts of England. He lectured on Divinity and Church History, worked with us through several books of Milton, gave a short course of history, read half the weekly essays written by us, and for some months during my residence took mathematics in the absence through illness of Mr. Tait. In addition, all the work of superintendence fell on him. The time-table shows that he had arranged that a very large share of the work should be in his own hands. Besides reading prayers at 6 or 6.30 in the morning, he invariably had a class immediately after morning prayers.

The influence he exercised was, as I suppose it would be in all similar cases, varied in degree according to the aptitude of temperament of the individual student. I distinguish in my own case between the sentiments he inspired and his value as a teacher in the ordinary sense. His value as a teacher in the larger sense of the word lay in the example of his life and conduct and in the stimulus which it furnished, and in the sentiments which his teaching inspired. Young as we were, we appreciated the tremendous energy of our Principal, every minute of whose day seemed to be occupied with his immediate duties to the college, and who yet found time to keep himself fully informed and to take intense interest in the political and other questions of the day, to get through all current literature, to tackle work sent from the Education Office, and yet to be always ready to entertain a few select friends, among whom the most constant visitor whom I can recall was Mr. Jowett. We recognised also his extraordinary power, and we took it as quite in the natural order of things that men like Macaulay, Tennyson, and others, whose fame was already wide-spread, should be among his ordinary visitors. His short sermons on Sundays were probably to most of us a revelation. They compelled our attention, because they combined simplicity and strength. They opened to us new views of life and of its duties, and gave us definite aims for the conduct of life and indications of what

we should strive to make ourselves. The magnetic power of the man was at no time more powerfully exercised than in the twenty minutes on Sunday morning in the chapel. His own life was an example which accentuated his teaching. What especially struck me, coming from an evangelical surrounding of the older school, was that he represented religious life as a discipline. Each of us was to make himself master of himself and to work out his own salvation, though I doubt whether he ever used the word. The terminology of the sermons was new. The struggle into manhood as he represented it was a manly one and helped to make us men. The sins for the repression of which he seemed to be in most deadly earnest were idleness and impurity. Dogma in the usual sense of the word there was little or none. Inspiring teaching directed to the development of a pure and active life, and urging self-discipline, was an excellent substitute.

Recalling many conversations which at meal-times especially he encouraged and took part in, one of Mr. Temple's most characteristic features strikes me as being his honesty of mind and lucidity of thought—thought which found expression in his directness of speech. It was not merely that he had cleared his mind of cant, if any ever existed there, but that he seemed incapable of taking refuge in platitudes or of using speech as a means of dissembling or concealing thought. He would not in any matter live up in a balloon. In his conversation on all kinds of subjects, political, historical, and general, we noticed that he faced facts. He constantly expressed opinions, sometimes even using slang words or phrases to make his meaning clear, which to our youthful prejudices were not a little startling. But they set us thinking for ourselves. In any kind of literary composition what he seemed to value most was clearness. I remember his saying that when the first two volumes of Macaulay's history came out he sat up all night and finished reading them. I feel confident that the historian's simplicity of style and lucid method of statement were regarded as among his chief merits. I rather fancy that the kind of eloquence, especially in the pulpit, which was then in fashion, was distasteful to Mr. Temple. To have something to say and to say it clearly and directly was the kind of speech he preferred.

I should not say that his teaching and example tended to make successful men, and the comparatively few among us who have risen in the world is a confirmation of my belief. His

teaching and influence resembled that of Carlyle, of whom at that time he was an admirer, urging all to do the duty which lay nearest, to fight the real devils of laziness and selfishness and disregard imaginary ones. If, as I suspect could be demonstrated, other institutions of a similar character sent out men in greater proportion, who have "got on" in the world, none probably has produced fewer failures.

I am indisposed to believe that Mr. Temple was by nature a kind-hearted man. My own theory, formed nearly half a century ago, is that he compelled himself to do the many kindly actions which indicated sympathy. It seemed to me, and still seems, that there were two spirits striving within him for mastery, a naturally domineering spirit, and a determination to act in a just and kindly manner.

The "beast but a just beast" story of some years later appealed to all who had been under him. Though he was a hero to all of us, a soldier whom we would have followed to the death, it was only when we came to know him better that we realised that there were streaks of gentleness and tenderness beneath his rugged surface.

One instance of his willingness to sacrifice his time for our benefit deserves noting. Latin formed no part of the regular educational course, but several of us wished to study it, and requested him to give us a lesson daily. He found that the only time at his disposal was at 5 A.M. Thirty of us availed ourselves of his offer. In the course of about two months the attendance, which was optional, had fallen off, until at last there were only two remaining, myself and another. We both felt that it was hard to get the Principal out of bed for us alone, and yet we did not wish to lose our Latin. Accordingly we went into his study, explained our difficulty, and urged him to try and squeeze half an hour out of some other portion of the day. I believe he appreciated our double motive, and he certainly acceded to our request.

Speaking of Mr. Temple as I knew him in these long-distant years, it does not appear to me that he was a good teacher in the ordinary sense of an instructor for a number of ill-prepared and young students. He was too capable a man himself to appreciate our difficulties. I was myself not below the average, either in knowledge or intelligence. In fact, I still hold two first prizes inscribed as such in his handwriting. But in some of the subjects which he taught, as, for example, geometry, he was of no use to me, simply.

because I was unable to follow the rapid explanation of problems which seemed so simple to him. In one of his classes, dealing with another subject, I was frequently so confused by his brusqueness of manner as constantly to make a bad show, one also which my fellow-students knew to be undeserved. On this matter I prefer to give my own experience, but I well know that many of my classmates shared the same fate.

Of stories illustrating Mr. Temple's laconic method of correspondence, even in the pre-postcard days, you will probably have enough. Here is one, perhaps worth recording. One of my fellow-students, a few years after he had left the hall, wrote, giving a long—and I am sure it would be a wearisome—account of his flirtations with a certain lady and asking for his advice. The answer came at once: "Dear —, Marry her. Yours truly—F. TEMPLE."

As I intend to remain *incognito*, I may be allowed to say that it has been my lot, during the many years since I have ceased to have anything to do with teaching, to meet many of the foremost literary men and statesmen of both the great political parties in England, and to have come in contact with foreigners who have left their mark for all time in European history. Of all whom I have met three stand out prominently, head and shoulders above all others, and among the three is the figure of Frederick Temple.

We get a glimpse of his domestic life at Kneller Hall from a letter written by his niece, Lady O'Brien, the daughter of the Archbishop's oldest brother, who grew up to manhood, William Octavius, mentioned earlier in this volume. He married, at an early age, a young Greek lady of good family; and, after serving in the 18th Royal Irish, was appointed head of the police in Santa Maura. She writes:—

My father died at Pasco in 1852, leaving my mother and his three children very badly off. My uncle (Mr. Temple), hearing of his brother's death, did what no one else would have done; he wrote to my mother to say he would look after us all. As I was the youngest, and had not been to school, he asked my mother to send me home. He was then at Kneller Hall. He sent my brother to Italy to finish his

education as a doctor, and my sister went with my mother back to Corfu. I lived two years at Kneller Hall with my grandmother and uncle, and he taught me everything I know. I shall never forget his love for his mother. Of an evening he used to sit on a footstool at her feet, the dear old lady playing with his hair.¹ On Saturday, men like Stanley, Scott, Lake, Jowett, Lingen, Sandford (afterwards Lord Sandford), Walrond, and many others used to come down. It was a great pleasure to me, child as I was then, to listen to their conversation; and sometimes one of them would say: "How do you express this or that in your Greek?" for I was more familiar then with modern Greek than English.

On the closing of Kneller Hall, Mr. Temple was made Inspector of Church of England Male Training Colleges, and his Reports for the years 1856 and 1857 are published in the Committee of Council's Minutes for the year 1856-57 and 1857-58. The former contains an interesting discussion of the use and treatment of practising schools, and of the right mode of teaching method. While laying great stress on instruction in the art of teaching, and recommending additional encouragement to be given by the Committee of Council to it, Mr. Temple does not advise the displacement of any "part of that general education which students in training colleges now receive, in order to make room for a special and professional system. It is of far more importance to a schoolmaster that he should have that knowledge and cultivation of faculties which it is his duty to communicate to children, than that he should know how to communicate them; the power of teaching he may gain by practice and experience; knowledge and cultivation it is almost impossible for him to gain when he has once

¹ The writer of this chapter can himself remember being struck, when Examiner at Rugby in 1858, with the infinite tenderness and love shown in Dr. Temple's face on meeting his mother in the drawing-room.

commenced the duties of life; he has neither the time nor the opportunity, nor within a very few years the necessary ductility and elasticity of mind.”¹

At the time of taking the Inspectorship Mr. Temple, in his private letters, spoke of his desire, “as soon as he could creditably do so, to disentangle himself from the Government schools.” This was accomplished by his election as Headmaster of Rugby.

¹ Rev. F. Temple's Report in Minutes of Committee of Council, 1856-57, p. 707.

CHAPTER II

COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY REFORM

Fellowships—Scholarships—Students' Aid Society.

SOON after leaving the University Mr. Temple had an opportunity of giving his opinion on the reforms needed there. The Oxford University Commission, which was appointed in August 1850, and which reported in April 1852, invited Mr. Temple, among others, to give evidence in writing. A brief account of the most noticeable recommendations may here be given. In order to lessen the expenses to undergraduates of an Oxford education, he recommended that the richer colleges should build and establish halls for about forty students each, where the meals should be in common and each student would have for himself one room to serve both as sitting and sleeping room. "There would be no necessity for making all the halls alike, provided only that care was taken to treat all the students most scrupulously as gentlemen. If it be worth while to educate them at all, it is worth while to give them that refinement and treat them with that consideration which belongs to the educated class in society." He reckoned that the total cost would be £75 per annum per student, and if the buildings and part of the warden and sub-warden's salaries were defrayed by the college, this might be reduced to £45, clothes and journeys bringing

each student's payments to £65 or £70. Admission of students to the University, without being connected with a college or hall, he thought inexpedient, except, perhaps, in the case of older men.

Mr. Temple advocated the assignment of from 75 to 100 fellowships in the larger colleges to physical and mathematical science, in order to remedy the then neglect of these studies, but giving students as free a choice of subjects of study as possible. He proposed the appropriation of the incomes of 57 fellowships to increasing the staff of professors, and providing them with a salary of £500 a year each. They would not be subjected to any theological test (except in the case of professors of divinity), and should be allowed to retire after fifteen years' work, with a pension of the same amount, to be obtained by a tax of 10 per cent on the revenues of all the colleges. They should be required to give a certain number of lectures every year, but attendance on the lectures should not be compulsory on the students.

The total number of fellowships in Oxford Mr. Temple puts at 572 (including all the studentships at Christ Church), and out of all this number he found "only 22 open in such a sense that a young man, on first coming up, sees his way clear towards them with no other bar than may arise from his own want of talent or diligence." These open fellowships were 10 at Balliol and 12 at Oriel. The 61 studentships at Christ Church, though not legally restricted, "were in the gift of the Canons in rotation, who treated them very much as private property. All the other fellowships were restricted, either to persons born in particular localities, or to Founders' kin, or to persons educated in particular schools." Mr. Temple advised the entire abolition of the first two restrictions and large modifications

of the last. Other minor restrictions were poverty, celibacy, and holy orders. The qualification of poverty had been practically dropped in most cases, and should be struck out of the statutes. Fellowships being held for life, celibacy should be retained, as the professorships would give openings enough for those whose natural vocation it might be to pass a life of study; holy orders should be retained in one-half the fellowships only. Every Fellow should be required to reside six years out of every ten. Electors to fellowships might immediately, after each election, be required to make a solemn declaration that they had voted for the man whom they believed best qualified.

Similar abolitions of restrictions should be made in the case of scholarships, and no scholarship should lead to a fellowship or even give a *ceteris paribus* preference in the scholar's own college. The natural turn of the fellowship examination would give them involuntarily quite sufficient preference.

Such interference with Founders' wills, as would be caused by the changes advocated, was justified by Mr. Temple in vigorous language:—

Nothing could possibly be farther from the Founders' intentions than the present system. They meant the Fellows to be resident. A large proportion hardly ever come near the place. They meant the Fellows to live a strict and severe life. The comfortable common-rooms and £200 a year do not represent that. They meant the Fellows to be *bona fide* students. Nothing could be more absurd than to call the present body such, except, perhaps, an endeavour to compel them to become such. In fact, it could hardly be possible to imagine a greater contrast than that between the ideal present to the Founders' minds of a poor, hard-working student of theology, copying manuscripts, disputing in the Schools, living a life of monastic severity, and the Fellow as he at present exists, with his comfortable rooms, liberty to roam over the world, and £200 a year with nothing to do for it. All that subserved private interests has been retained.

all that conduced to public benefit has been given up. . . . In short, a literal interpretation of the Founders' wills has become, by the change of time and circumstances, a mere superstition. To secure the great object at which they aimed, the advancement of learning and religion, is a duty. To seek it by means which are now found not to reach it, or to tie it to conditions which are now found to render it unattainable, is absurd. To make the changes proposed is not an interference with private property, for the property is not private; it is not the betrayal of a trust, for the trust was essentially conditional; it is not a departure from the intentions of the founders, for it only gives up a secondary object, when no other way remains to secure a primary; and it is demanded by common justice, for the colleges are now injuring the University under whose shelter they were intended to live. Of all the reforms to be made at Oxford this appears to me to be the vital one. The Fellows have become the head of the University, and the nation is bound to see that they are the ablest men which the University can supply.

Other recommendations made by Mr. Temple relate to matters of less general interest, and on that account may be here omitted. But on arrangements for helping poor students, it may be well here to add what he wrote to Dr. Scott in January 1866:—

I really think that the first thing to be done is to get rid of the monopoly of the colleges. A lodging-house system would require some care; in particular, as I suggested to Palmer, it might be well to require that the servants to wait on the lodgers should either be boys or women over thirty. And it might be well that the lodging-houses should be put expressly under the supervision of definite M.A.'s. Say one to have the supervision of thirty lodgings, and to be the tutor of the men who lodged in them. Rules of this sort might be desirable, and, if care were taken not to make their stringency operate to prevent a man from living economically, would work well. But when we have done all that, if it ever is done, much remains, I think, to be done in the way of aiding poor men. Now I do not think you will get—I cannot say that I think you ought to get—much money subscribed to spend in stone and mortar. If you want a

new college you will have, I think, to raise the money in Oxford. But you will, I am pretty sure, get money to spend in directly aiding those who need aid.

I despair of working an endowment for such a purpose. Endowments have such a tendency to routine, and routine is always fatal to true charity. True charity cannot dispense with its best element, personal trouble, and all endowments have a tendency to dispense with that and have recourse to system in its place. What I should like to see in Oxford is a Students' Aid Society, depending for its funds entirely on annual subscriptions, administered by a committee of residents who should give their aid quite privately after careful personal inquiry. I know men in Oxford to whom I could trust any money I could spare for such an object, and never ask a question about the use made of it. I have no doubt that very few non-resident Oxford men do not also know such men amongst the residents.

This would be, I believe, far the best way of providing aid to those who would be the better for University teaching, but are not clever enough to have a chance of getting an open scholarship anywhere. There are such men, men who would make admirable clergymen, whom now we lose altogether, or else half educate for their work. When the time comes for considering schemes for helping poor students, do consider this among the rest.

CHAPTER III

NATIONAL ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

Dr. Temple's contribution to the *Oxford Essays* (1856) on National Education—His evidence before the Newcastle Commission (The Royal Commission on Popular Education, 1860)—Application of rates to National Education—Other means of financial support—Popular management—School grants—Religious settlement.

THE *Oxford Essays* for 1856 includes one by Mr. Temple on National Education, and in 1860 (January 27) he gave evidence before the Popular Education Commission, presided over by the Duke of Newcastle. It is interesting to note the views taken by so competent a judge as Mr. Temple of the difficulties and dangers which seemed then to surround the question of National Education.

At the time Mr. Temple wrote his Essay in 1856 the Committee of Council on Education had been at work only sixteen years, having begun in 1839. They had aided and improved the buildings of 3800 elementary schools and 39 normal schools. They had a staff of 41 inspectors, and in 1855 actually inspected all the normal schools, and 4800 out of 6500 elementary schools which were liable to inspection. They paid pupil teachers, augmented the salaries of teachers, and gave grants for books; but the total amount of the moneys voted by Parliament for the Council's expenditure for the sixteen

years amounted only to £2,000,000. A capitation grant was in 1853 allowed to small places, and in January 1856 was extended to all the country, on the conditions that no child should be reckoned who did not actually attend school for 176 days in the year, that 14s. for each boy and 12s. for each girl was raised from other sources than Parliament; that the parent or guardian should pay 1d. per week for each child, and that a certificated or registered teacher should be employed.¹

That this system, which Sir James Kay Shuttleworth had largely promoted, had done a great deal of good work was generally admitted. But it had not by any means covered all the ground, and the extension of it for this purpose meant, as Mr. Temple with others apprehended, enormous expense, more than Parliament would be likely to allow, perhaps £5,000,000 a year.² It would necessitate relaxation of the conditions on which the grant should be made, and would tend to diminish local exertions. The mischief was, in Mr. Temple's opinion, growing faster than the good.³ The system was framed on the basis of aiding local effort, but to reach the poorer and more apathetic districts, less and less would be demanded from the locality, and as a central office can only proceed on rigid lines, the relaxation would be general, and the money easily got would be easily spent; £5,000,000 from a central fund would probably not do more than £2,000,000 from local rates.⁴ Meantime the system tended to benefit rich districts and to give little aid to the poor. Four poor parishes in London, with a population of 138,900, received from the Committee of Council £12:0:8, while

¹ Lingen, Pop. Educ. Com. Evid. i. Q. 32, 227, 234.

² It may be worth noting that the grants voted by the House of Commons in 1902-1903 amounted to nearly £11,000,000.

³ Pop. Ed. Com. Q. 2463.

⁴ *Ibid.* Evid. Q. 2640; Essay (as above), p. 248.

four parishes with an aggregate population of 50,000 received £3908.¹

It was clear to all those who proposed at this time to deal with the matter in Parliament, that if the whole country was to be educated, resort must be had to rates. Mr. Temple accepted this necessity without hesitation. "Local rates locally administered can be worked together with a central grant, where subscriptions cannot. While the contributions are voluntary, the Government can never distinguish between those who cannot and those who will not give; when the contributions are compulsory and are based on ascertainable property, the difficulty vanishes." And if a maximum be fixed for the rate, a grant may supply the deficiency and the poor districts be reached.²

But rates were not the only local contributions to which Mr. Temple looked. He pressed for the reform of the charitable endowments applicable to education, and for the use in primary inspected schools of those which were not intended for higher education. Nor was he willing to give up the children's pence. On the contrary, he proposed to make them the basis of admitting the parents to a share in the management of the schools.

It will seem mere enthusiasm to maintain that the labourers should have any voice in the management of the schools where their children are to be educated. And yet if the labouring class are ever to learn any kind of self-government, the management of their children's education is the most within their reach. They would never attempt to manage directly, but they would be quite capable of choosing good managers to act for them. It is likely enough they would make many mistakes; but there is a sound bottom of good sense in the English character on which statesmen may securely build, and in no class is good sense more strong than among the labouring men.

¹ Quoted from Sir J. Packington; *Essay*, p. 248.

² *Essay*, p. 249.

If a fair average fee for one child, say 2d. a week for forty-five weeks, were made the title to a vote, whether paid by a labourer in weekly or by a subscriber in annual instalments; if every person so paying an annual fee were allowed to keep one child in the school, whether his own or any other person's, free of all future charges, the labourers would be enabled to take a part in the management of the schools without dislodging those who contributed from motives of charity. In this way objections to rates would be entirely met. The rates would not kill the subscriptions; indeed, the ratepayers would eventually come to be a different class from the subscribers. The subscription would be generally paid, not to support the school, but to procure admission for a child; even the subscribers from the higher classes would most often subscribe in order to have the power of assisting their poorer neighbours by putting in their children. In this way, too, the religious difficulty in all future schools might be most easily got over. Let the subscribers (who would include the more respectable of the parents) be empowered to elect on the managing committee a minister of religion to take charge of the religious teaching. On default of such express elections, let that office and the corresponding seat on the committee go to the clergyman of the parish. If there were sufficient population in the parish, different denominations would have, as now, different schools. If not, it is far better to put the choice in the hands of the parents than to give it either to the District Committee or to the Committee of Council.¹

The further practical steps recommended by Mr. Temple were to substitute a capitation grant for the specific grants then made; to forbid the Committee of Council to grant to any one school a total sum more than one-half (he would prefer one-fourth) of the total amount derived from local sources; to give them power, where there was no efficient school, to order (subject to the tacit consent of both Houses of Parliament) a rate to be levied sufficient to cover one-half the ordinary expenditure besides maintaining and improving the school buildings, or, if necessary, building new

¹ Essay, pp. 258-260 (condensed).

schools. Each Poor Law Union would elect a board of School Guardians to administer the rate in aid of the various schools, on conditions approved by the Committee of Council. Schools built with aid would be managed as the present schools are ; schools entirely built by the rates would be entirely managed by the Guardians. Existing schools would not be interfered with, except to give parents the right of withdrawal from the religious instruction.¹

This last point is one which is argued by Mr. Temple with great force and in striking language. Religious zeal had been used by the Government as the great agent for spreading education. "No schools were to be aided which did not embody religious teaching as part of their system ; and religious liberty was to be so scrupulously respected that the Government was not to interfere, except indirectly, with the management, discipline, or instruction." The result was that, omitting schools supported by endowments or by the State, of the ordinary elementary schools in which the children of labourers were educated, ninety-five per cent were denominational.²

The denominational character is considered by the bulk of the (High Church) party as the only one that is consistent with the right of religious liberty, and the only one that really acknowledges the importance of religious teaching. The phrase "religious liberty" is ambiguous. By religious liberty may be meant the liberty of self-government by a religious community or the liberty of religious action by an individual. These two senses, so far from being identical, are most often mentally opposed. To allow religious liberty to a community is very often only another phrase for allowing the oppression of the members by the leaders, of the quiet by the busy. The concession of religious liberty to a religious body means the permission to exercise their own laws and

¹ Pop. Educ. Com. Evid. Q. 2821.

² Essay, pp. 225, 235.

their own discipline over their own members ; it means the permission to inflict any penalty not exceeding excommunication. Now of what do these communities consist, and how are they governed ? They generally consist, first, of a considerable portion of steady but not very eager adherents, who either belong to the sect by birth, or have found in its worship, for one reason or another, a sort of religious resting-place for their lives ; and, secondly, of a much smaller body of warm partisans, who are what they are by conviction, and who take the lead by virtue of their greater zeal and activity. The former are very often earnest but quiet Christians. Among them, indeed, are to be found a great variety, from the lukewarm or worldly, who join a religious community because it is respectable to do so, to the devout but retired saint who abstains from any leading position out of humility or modesty. The smaller and busier section, however, look on themselves, and are looked on by a sort of tacit consent of the rest, as the truly religious. Few observe the depth and force of religion sometimes to be found in the careful discharge of the duties of the day. The religious impulse, which, like a dumb instinct, moves some men unconsciously through a quiet round of daily labour, seems mechanical in comparison with the fervent devotional life which appropriates to itself every ejaculation of St. Paul. Yet these men, who study to be quiet and to do their own business, must always be the large majority in any healthy community of long standing. And what do these men want ? Chiefly, no doubt, to be let alone. They want to take as much of the religious system in which they find themselves, or which they have joined, as suits their religious needs and no more. One man likes the Wesleyan minister's sermons, but does not want the class-leader's exhortations or the public confession of experiences. Another likes the Church service, but cannot agree with the clergyman's notions, and will not join in any of his plans. Another likes the clergyman's conversation, but does not like his preaching, and will more gladly come to church when there is no sermon. There is a great variety in taste, in feeling, in opinion. But all this class agree in a wish to be left to themselves, to select their spiritual food by their own experience of its utility. It would be the greatest mistake to call them irreligious. We may, if we please, rank them below the others. We may think of the more brilliant, or the more stirring characters as the waiting virgins or the active servants of the last triad.

of parables. And we may class these as the dumb sheep who will be quite astonished at the last day to find that what they have done for their fellow-men out of pure kindness of heart they have really done for Christ. But wherever we may class them, they are too valuable a body in every religious community to make it expedient that their rights should be neglected. And these are the men whose religious liberty is in danger when the religious liberty of the denomination is unrestricted.

These men are to be found in every sect, but they are peculiarly numerous in the Church. Partly the connexion with the State compels an amount of toleration which could not otherwise be obtained, partly the Church herself, whatever may appear on the surface, still retains her peculiarly English character. It is, indeed, the Church's large toleration of this class of men quite as much as the piety of many of her members, and much more than her distinctive teaching, that constitutes her chief hold upon the nation; and nothing would more rapidly and utterly ruin the Church as a national institution than such a restoration of her corporate religious liberty as would enable her officers to meddle with these apparently cool partisans. At present the Church of England is nearly, if not quite, the most tolerant religious body on the face of the earth. In the Church of England, if nowhere else, a Christian knows of a spiritual home which will give him a worship, and a guide, and the sacraments without forcing his conscience in the smallest particular. . . . The Dissenter generally looks upon the body to which he belongs, not as something above him to be honoured, but as something in which he bears a part. The religious Churchman feels for the Church more what a grown-up son feels for a mother—not submission of judgment, but affection of heart. He agrees, of course, with the outline of her doctrines, and very often he goes far beyond general agreement, and holds on conviction every detail of her distinctive teaching, but even then the characteristic of his attachment is much rather a sense of belonging to her family and owing much to her influence, than a readiness to maintain all her formularies. Hence the Church includes among her attached members a large body remarkable for the union of quietness with earnestness, but by no means prepared to maintain details of doctrine or to resist changes of discipline, or to press into prominence what is commonly meant by distinctive, that is, in reality, controverted, points of teaching. To exclude

this body from the Church's operations would be a great mistake; to oppress them a still greater.

The distinction between the religious liberty of a communion and the religious liberty of an individual becomes immediately practical when applied to schools. If absolute liberty were granted to religious communities, several would found schools in which the management would be entrusted to the religious leaders, as such, and the children would be instructed in distinctive religious formularies or not admitted at all. If religious liberty were reserved to individuals, the management of every school would be open to all members of the denomination to which the school belonged, and the parents of the scholars would be permitted to withdraw their children from any part of the teaching without withdrawing them from the rest. The Denominational party have already contested both these points with the Government. The celebrated management clauses of 1847 were in some degree an attempt on the part of the Committee of Council to defend the religious liberty of individuals against the community to which they belonged. The High Church party would have founded schools to be governed by the clergy alone: the Government refused to consider the religious leaders as identical with the religious body, and insisted on the admission of the laity. The other, and much more important point,—the liberty of the parents to withdraw their children from any part of the teaching—has never been pressed by the Government, though often recommended. If public money is given, the State is bound to see that the religious liberty of the denominations is not made a liberty to oppress. It is quite true that very many clergymen, acting thoroughly in harmony with the tolerant spirit of the Church, practically admit the children of Dissenters without imposing on them obnoxious teaching. But this is a matter of favour, not of right; and in any national system the religious liberty of the labouring classes cannot be left as a matter of favour.¹

Mr. Temple proceeds to argue that—

It is a mere exaggeration to say that religious teaching imperatively demands a denominational system. That system may perhaps, on the whole, be the best way of securing religious teaching, but it is not the only way, and

¹ Essay, pp. 242, 244.

there is a point beyond which it ceases to be so much a security for religious as for doctrinal teaching; and to lay so much stress on the doctrinal instruction of children (in elementary schools) is a mere mistake.¹ Nor would a child who had learnt the Catechism be more likely on that account to remain a member of the Church in after-life if circumstances pulled him another way. Regular attendance at Church has a very considerable effect in making children grow up Churchmen: but attendance at Church is now connected with the Sunday-school and little with the day-school. The clergyman has in reality as great a hold upon the school as he ever can use, if he shares in the management, and has thus the right of frequent and authoritative entrance.²

But Mr. Temple does not leave this part of the subject without pointing out that—

The zeal by which the denominational system had been sustained in connexion with the Committee of Council was largely the zeal of the clergy. Of the large number of schools erected before 1851, half at least were due to the unwearied personal exertions and personal sacrifices of the clergy and the clergy alone. But if there is no limit to their self-devotion, there is a limit to their powers, and that limit is not far off. Without more aid from the State, they cannot do much more.³

In the latter part of this Essay Mr. Temple dealt with two matters with which he was afterwards to be particularly concerned,—the great resources for education which were then wasted in the form of endowments, and the duty of organising the education of the middle classes, and for this purpose remodelling the grammar schools.⁴ The University Local Examinations may be regarded as the first step in this direction of improving the education of the class above that going to the elementary schools.

¹ See also his Answers 2771–2779, given in 1873 to House of Commons Committee on Endowed Schools Act (1869).

² Essay, p. 244.

³ *Ibid.* p. 246.

⁴ *Ibid.* pp. 257, 264.

CHAPTER IV

UNIVERSITY LOCAL EXAMINATIONS

Examination of middle-class schools in the West (1857)—Adoption of the scheme for Oxford and Cambridge Local Examinations (1857-58).

MR., afterwards Sir Thomas, Acland, an able and earnest man, distinguished in the Oxford schools, with many accomplishments and varied interests, eager to help farmers and promote education, hit upon the idea of having a voluntary examination at Exeter, of boys in middle-class schools in Cornwall, Devon, and Somerset, in order to ascertain the deficiencies of the schools, and help to give a standard of attainment. With the aid of other west-country potentates, and the cordial support of some of the leading schoolmasters, private as well as others, in the district, the idea was carried out in June 1857. The scheme and conduct of the examination were largely framed and directed by Mr. Temple, who, with Mr. Bowstead, an Inspector of Protestant dissenting schools, was allowed by the Committee of Council to give his services for this object. It was an experiment thought likely to show whether middle-class schools were disposed to avail themselves of such a test of their work, and what practical arrangements might be made for the purpose. One hundred and seven scholars from schools of various descriptions were examined, and Mr. Temple wrote an interesting report on the

examination which, with other instructive papers, is given in a volume by Mr. Acland, called: *An Account of the Origin and Objects of the Oxford Associate in Arts Examination*, 2nd ed. (1858), p. 160 foll.

While the arrangements for the Exeter examination were being made, Mr. Acland and Mr. Temple became desirous of giving permanent shape to the idea, and extending the examinations to the whole of England. Mr. Temple was clearly of opinion that the Government would not take up the project, but thought the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge would. Accordingly, in April 1857, in a letter to Dr. Jeune, Master of Pembroke College, Oxford (afterwards Bishop of Peterborough), he proposed a definite plan for this purpose, and on April 24 followed it up by giving his reasons for holding "that such a scheme of examination would be generally welcomed by those who are concerned in the education of the middle classes, and would not fail for want of candidates to be examined."¹ He was able to adduce the instances of the Society of Arts Examination for adults from mechanics' institutes, and other examinations which had been organised in several counties for schools of a somewhat lower character.² He had himself taken part in the first examination of the Society of Arts in June 1856. Mr. Temple's plan was, in the first instance, put before a few members of the Universities, who warmly approved of the proposal, and afterwards before different parties in the country. Memorials were presented to the Universities praying them to accept the task. Mr. Temple and Mr. Acland, Dr. Gifford and others, in May 1857, had an interview

¹ Acland's *Account*, pp. 75-81.

² Thus the College of Preceptors had organised, a few years before, examinations of a similar character, which Mr. Temple (as he stated to Mr. J. S. Thornton in March 1825) regarded not as unsuitable in themselves, but as lacking authority.

with the Hebdomadal Council at Oxford, and the Council of the Senate at Cambridge. With great promptness in June 1857 (after the report of a committee drawn by Dr. Scott, Master of Balliol), Oxford adopted a scheme for an examination of senior and junior candidates to commence on June 21, 1858, and later Cambridge adopted a scheme in most respects similar,¹ to commence on December 14, 1858, senior candidates being, in each case, under eighteen years of age, juniors being under fifteen for Oxford, under sixteen for Cambridge; the examinations to be held not merely at the University itself, but simultaneously at other places, where proper arrangements were made. The title of Associate in Arts, as proposed by Mr. Temple, was conferred by the University of Oxford on candidates who passed that University's senior examination. The body of examiners contained some of the leading members in the Universities, and Mr. Temple himself, then Headmaster of Rugby, took part in the first examination.

That so little time was lost in getting the scheme accepted and put in practice was due, in some degree at least, to Mr. Temple's characteristic combination of judgment and energy. He writes to Mr. Acland, April 20, 1857 :—

I am very strongly impressed with the saying of an old Chancellor of the Exchequer that the worst fault in a

¹ It may be interesting to give part of Dr. Temple's comment on some points in the Cambridge plan. He says in a letter to Dr. Scott (dated March 19, 1858): "The difference in principle between the Cambridge plan and ours is the treatment of the religious examination. They make their religious examination non-church, and then press everybody into it. We make ours Church and leave it quite open. I must say also that I miss a distinct study of the Prayer-book, which, to tell the truth, I care for much more than I do for the history of the Reformation. That a young man who belongs to our Church should be thoroughly alive to all the meaning of our chief book of devotions, I consider a great gain: that he should know the history, not always creditable, by which our Church escaped from Rome, I cannot put on a level with it."

financial scheme is if you cannot carry it through the House of Commons. In my letter to Jeune I tried very hard to divest my plan of any appearance of a wish to forward some favourite crotchet, under the guise of a general measure. I want to carry the plan; and the worst scheme that can be carried will be infinitely better, *me judice*, than the best that cannot. For this reason I left out several things.¹

It would be out of place here to describe the development of the system of University Local Examinations thus started. But it is interesting to note that in 1858 the numbers of senior candidates entered for the examination were 431 boys for Oxford and 76 for Cambridge; the numbers of junior candidates (boys) were 816 for Oxford and 311 for Cambridge. The numbers for 1902 were, seniors (boys and girls), 2128 for Oxford, 2493 for Cambridge; juniors (boys and girls), 5428 for Oxford, 8521 for Cambridge. In 1902 both Universities had many other examinations under the same management.

¹ *Memoir of the Rt. Hon. Sir Thomas Dyke Acland* (private), p. 184; kindly lent by Sir Charles Thomas Acland.

CHAPTER V

SCHOOLS INQUIRY COMMISSION¹

Appointment of the Commission (1864)—Report of the Commission (1868)—Organisation of Secondary Education—Endowments—Religious instruction—Secular instruction—Technical instruction—Girls' Schools—Grammar Schools—Endowed Schools Act (1869)—Evidence before the Secondary Education Commission^g (1894)—Summary of Dr. Temple's views.

AT the meeting of the Social Science Association in Edinburgh in 1863, attention was called to middle-class education, and, in accordance with a resolution then passed, an influential deputation, consisting of Lord Brougham, Lord Fortescue, Lord Lyttelton, the Bishop of London, and others, waited (June 18, 1864) on Lord Palmerston, the Premier, and asked him to appoint a Commission to inquire into the schools which had not been the subject of inquiry under the Popular Education Commission or the Public Schools Commission. The request was granted, and Lord Granville, as President of the Council, took the chief part in the selection of Commissioners. There is reason to think that Dr. Temple was consulted. The Commission was issued at the end of the year (December 28, 1864). The Commissioners were Lord Taunton as Chairman, Lord Stanley, Lord

¹ Dr. Temple's work on this Commission, though during his Rugby term, is dealt with here to preserve its connexion with his other outside educational work.

Lyttelton, Sir Stafford Northcote, Dr. Hook (Dean of Chichester), Dr. Temple, Mr. Thorold (afterwards Bishop of Winchester), Mr. Acland, Mr. Edward Baines, Mr. W. E. Forster, Mr. Peter Erle (Chief Charity Commissioner), and Dr. Storrar. The secretary was the writer of this chapter. Of these, Lord Stanley and Sir Stafford Northcote took much interest in the preliminary discussions and in the examination of witnesses, but ceased to attend the meetings after July 1866, when they became Cabinet Ministers under Lord Derby. The others attended very regularly throughout, took part in the discussion of the Report, and all signed it.¹ But the leading spirit was Dr. Temple, and, next to him, Lords Taunton and Lyttelton; Mr. Acland and Mr. Forster also contributed in a noticeable degree to the conduct of the inquiry and framing of the Report.

The field of the inquiry was large. It took in, with the exception of the nine (so-called) public schools which were the subject of a previous Commission, all school education above the National and British schools and below the Universities; and thus included many schools of the same general character as the nine (so-called) public schools. It dealt with girls' education as well as with that of boys, and with private and proprietary schools as well as with endowed schools; but the so-called grammar schools, about 700 in number, were the principal subject of inquiry and report, and were all visited by assistant commissioners employed by the Commission.² The Report of the Commissioners, which

¹ Sir Stafford Northcote indeed also signed it, but withdrew his signature in order not to separate himself from Lord Stanley, who thought that as members of the Cabinet they had better abstain from committing themselves to the recommendations contained in it.

² It may be interesting to note that among the assistant commissioners were the late Bishop Fraser and Mr. Matthew Arnold, Mr. James Bryce, Mr. Daniel Fearon (subsequently one of the Charity Commis-

was issued in the spring of 1868, formed a thick 8vo volume, and evidence and subordinate reports formed twenty other volumes. But we are concerned here with the Commissioners' Report only. Dr. Temple drew up, partly at the secretary's suggestion, a preliminary skeleton of the Report, which was discussed and in the main adopted, but not published. Of the seven chapters of the Report itself, Chapters II. and IV., giving an account of the state of the schools and of the law affecting them, were mainly the work of the secretary. Chapter III., on local distribution of endowments, was suggested and partly executed by Mr. Acland (who had drawn up for the consideration of the Commissioners five elaborate memoranda, chiefly on the statistics of middle-class education, and on central and local administration). Chapter V., on eight large endowments, and Chapter VI., on girls' schools, were due chiefly to Lord Lyttelton. But the chapters which contained most opinion, viz. Chapter II., on the kinds of education desirable, and Chapter VII., giving the recommendations of the Commissioners, were of course, like some other parts, very fully discussed, but were drafted by Dr. Temple, and are practically his work and in his words. One part of Chapter II., viz. the section on Private Schools, was also compiled by him. In the pressure incidental to the completion of the Report the secretary found himself unable to do this part in time, and mentioned the fact to Dr. Temple, who at once undertook it, and completed it in a few days. It was probably on this occasion that, as he told his family in after-life, he wrote for thirty-six hours, having tea brought to

sioners), Mr. James L. Hammond, Fellow and Bursar of Trinity College, Cambridge; Mr., afterwards Sir J. G. Fitch; Mr. (afterwards Mr. Justice) Wright; Mr. D. C. Richmond (lately Auditor-General); Mr., afterwards Professor, Thomas H. Green, and other distinguished men.

him at intervals, and the printer's devil in constant attendance. Certainly, when he announced to the secretary the completion of this work, he looked as if he had not spared himself. It must be remembered that throughout the three years and more that the Commissioners sat, Dr. Temple was Headmaster of Rugby, and had this labour in addition to all his other engagements.

The Commissioners met 115 times, always in London. Dr. Temple attended 35 of the 68 meetings which were occupied with settling forms of inquiry and taking evidence, and all those concerned with the consideration of the Report (47).¹ The chapters which he undertook were chiefly written in his school vacations. He was in frequent communication with the secretary, and always ready to assist. It was only an instance of the "primacy" which he in fact held in the work of the Commission, and of the confidence which he inspired, when, after the last meeting of the Commissioners, the Chairman said to the secretary that, if in going over the Report for presentation to Her Majesty and consequent publication, he found that there was anything which should be altered, he need not call another meeting, but Dr. Temple's approval would be sufficient.

Persons who desire to see Dr. Temple's opinion on the many points raised in the Report will not go far wrong if they refer for this purpose to Chapters II. and VII. No doubt the Oxford Essay is a purer expression of his views; he there wrote what he thought, and as he thought. In the Report he was writing for others as well as for himself; and even where (as was almost always the case) the words are his, they may yet exhibit the

¹ Lord Taunton attended 111 meetings, Lord Lyttelton all except the four last, Mr. Acland 110 meetings, and all the other Commissioners attended very well, some as constantly as the above.

influence of others, and have received conscious and unconscious modification, both as regards the opinions in general, and the relative importance of the details. No one could have been more willing to listen to the suggestions of others, and allow full weight to them. There was never any sign of irritation or pique when his opinions or statements were disputed. Stories of him in his subsequent life may have given those who did not know him an impression of stiffness and brusqueness which certainly did not appear in his bearing as a Commissioner. Always business-like and attentive, he took his part in any pleasantries to which discussion gave rise, and, as a strong man, enjoyed the work, and entered with zest into every part of it. It speaks much for the earnestness and good sense of the whole Commission that the Report was adopted by all who had taken part in its framing without any serious conflict of opinion at any stage of its preparation. Yet the Report dealt with a good deal of contentious matter, and made bold recommendations.

A brief account may here be given of some of the more important questions treated in it, so far as they are illustrative of Dr. Temple's views.

Secondary education in England required, above everything, to be organised. Hitherto schools for the middle classes had been left to themselves, as isolated units, without any established relation between their situation or purposes. Endowed schools were regarded as private trusts, and handled accordingly by the Court of Chancery, without free adjustment to the wishes of the locality, and without subordination to any general plan. The Charity Commission, though it had done much good, was subject to similar restraint, and had no officers selected for their knowledge of education and qualified to give the schools information and advice.

It is no longer possible for each grammar school to teach all kinds of scholars, and to be content with only one curriculum. What is best suited to boys who leave at eighteen or nineteen years of age is not best for those leaving at sixteen, and still less for those leaving at fourteen. The grammar schools should be remodelled, so as to leave some of the first grade, where the scholars are likely to be of a class carrying on their school education longest, others to be of the second or intermediate grade, and others of the third grade; and such a distribution should be carried out in each of the eleven Registrar-Generals' divisions of the country, power being reserved to counties eventually, perhaps, to make themselves the area for organisation.¹ Exhibitions should be provided so as to enable the poorer boys, who cannot obtain the higher education for which they are qualified at the school they are attending, to pay the fees of a school higher in grade.

Endowments should be used, not to provide indiscriminate gratuitous education, but (1) to supply exhibitions, awarded by merit, tenable at the school, and others tenable at some higher school or place of instruction, not necessarily the University; (2) to repair or improve the school buildings; and (3) to pay examiners.

Indiscriminate gratuitous education,² on which at present a very large proportion of the income of endowments is wasted, has been demonstrated to be as invariably mischievous as indiscriminate almsgiving. In far the majority of cases

¹ See letter, dated 1883, to Mr. C. T. D. Acland, on County Education, vol. ii. pp. 650, 651.—En.

² In 1873 Bishop Temple said: "The question of universal free schools I look upon as quite in the distant future. I do not say that I should be prepared to approve of it, but neither should I be prepared to object to a system of free education which went up to the very highest education." (Evid. Select Com. Endowed Sch. Act (1869), Q. 2682.)

the result is simply to degrade the school and make it useless, even to those whom it purposes to benefit, while the competition at the same time damages the private schools in the neighbourhood, and by artificially lowering the price of education, of necessity injures its quality. The only remedy is obviously to confine the gratuitous instruction (whether complete or partial) to those who are most capable of profiting by it. The simplest mode of doing this is undoubtedly the best, namely, to select the boys by their ability and attainment. Boys over thirteen can be best selected by open competitive examinations, and the more absolutely open they are made the better. For boys under thirteen there is reason to fear this might prove too severe a strain. Whenever it is desirable to give gratuitous schooling to children so young as this, it would seem best to select them from particular schools after a careful observation of their industry and progress for a year preceding.

Nor is it desirable to put on the candidates any restrictions based on poverty. It is not for the interest of the poor that they should be marked as poor within the school to which they are admitted. Further, since the object is to select those who are to make education a means of rising, the best test is that the competitors should be pitted against other boys of the very class into which they are to make their way. Moreover, it is exceedingly difficult to define poverty. To decide cases on their merits would often be inquisitorial, and some of the most deserving would be sure to be shut out from unwillingness to plead their own cause. Nor, again, has the rich boy any real advantage as a rule in the competition. The son of a peer cannot get better instruction in arithmetic than is within the reach of the son of a peasant; and arithmetic ought to be made a cardinal point in the education of little boys. The victory would really depend, as it ought to depend, on natural talent, in which there is no reason to think the poor boy would be deficient, and on industry, in which he would have every inducement to be superior. Whenever aid is to be confined to the poor, it should be done, not by restricting the freedom of competition in the higher schools, but by attaching the exhibition to schools of the third grade. To give the privileges of foundation by open competition, so far from thwarting the desire of the founders to benefit the poor, is now the only method of really fulfilling that desire. But no one can possibly doubt that it is the only method

of furthering the other and more important purpose, the promotion of education; for an open competition not only educates those whom it admits, it educates also those whom it rejects.¹

As regards religious instruction in endowed schools, Dr. Temple held that any express rule prescribing instruction in Church or other formularies need not be abrogated if older than 1800; where there was no such school, the provincial authority should choose between two rules: one, that the religious instruction should be in accordance with the doctrines of the Church of England; the other, that the children should be instructed in the Holy Scriptures, the former rule being most suitable where the Church was much in the majority, the latter where it was much in the minority, but every case to be considered on its own merits and due regard paid to the wishes of the locality. And there might be instances in which it would be justifiable in new public schools to give secular instruction only, opportunity being given for religious instruction by ministers of religion. A conscience clause (protected by an appeal) should be introduced in all schools except such as are the exclusive property of particular religious denominations, and in cathedral schools its introduction is desirable, but should not be compulsory. A master keeping a boarding-house should not be compelled to admit a conscience clause. Trusteeship should not be restricted to members of the Church of England, nor mastership to the clerical profession; and the jurisdiction of the ordinary should be either abolished or transferred to the provincial authority.²

¹ Schools Inquiry Commission Report, pp. 593-598 (condensed). (See also evidence given to the House of Commons Select Committee on Endowed Sch. (1869) Act, Q. 2526 foll.)

² *Ibid.* pp. 585-601.

As regards secular instruction, Dr. Temple thought Greek should be given up as a regular part of the course of study except in schools of the first grade, and that some of these should replace it by other studies; that the study of English literature and French should be warmly encouraged, but that Latin should continue to hold its place both for its own excellence as a means of cultivation, and because schoolmasters can in most cases teach it better than anything else. Arithmetic is a necessity, and mathematics in general ought to receive more attention than they do. Perhaps Euclid is not the best book to commence geometry,¹ and practical geometry might precede. Natural science ought to be more largely introduced; descriptive botany, or in some cases zoology, being most suitable for young boys, and experimental physics and chemistry, as soon as boys reach an age when they can be taught with scientific precision.²

Technical instruction was not thought to be within the scope of the Commission, but attention having been called to the need of it by Dr. Lyon Playfair (afterwards Lord Playfair), the Commissioners requested the opinion of various experts, and made Dr. Playfair's letter and these replies the subject of a special report in July 1867.

For the supply of buildings for new third-grade schools, and of exhibitions into them from the

¹ Dr. Temple urged Mr. (afterwards Archdeacon, and now Canon) Wilson, the senior mathematical master at Rugby at that time, to write a text-book of geometry on lines less artificial than those of Euclid. This book was published in 1868, and in the preface Mr. Wilson says: "Much of what is most characteristic in the book is due to Dr. Temple. It was at his wish I undertook the work, as he is strongly impressed with the need of it; and his criticism and his contributions to it have enabled me to rearrange it and improve it in some important respects." The publication of this book led to the formation of the Association for the Improvement of Geometrical Teaching, and its principles are said to be now recognised in nearly all public examinations.

² Sch. Inq. Rep. pp. 29-35, 581.

public elementary schools, Dr. Temple recommended every parish to be allowed to rate itself; and for higher schools, towns to be allowed the same.¹

Girls' schools were so little regarded at that time, at least as a subject of public inquiry, that the Commissioners debated whether the very general words of the Commission were really to be understood as including them, some of the Commissioners pointing out that girls' education, except for the classes going to the elementary schools, was usually conducted at home or in select boarding-schools not in any way of a public character. Dr. Temple was decidedly in favour of carrying the inquiry to girls' education as well as to boys, and the Commissioners did all that seemed possible in that direction. Their action, and the evidence given them by Miss Emily Davies, Miss Buss, Miss Beale, and other ladies, had much effect in directing attention to the importance of establishing day-schools for girls, and stimulating and rewarding girls' education. But the movement was not yet familiar to the English mind, and when Miss Davies started the idea of a girls' college with a University standard (such as was afterwards established at Girton) Dr. Temple was not sanguine of its success.

Dr. Temple came to the subject of reform of the grammar schools prepared by an independent study of a great many foundations, as set forth in the voluminous reports of Lord Brougham's Charity Commission. And his view was strengthened and confirmed by the examination made by the Schools Inquiry Assistant Commissioners. The aim of the founders (he argues) as a whole was to put a liberal education within the reach of boys of all classes.

¹ Sch. Inq. Rep. p. 656.

“When, for instance, a founder desires the education to be gratuitous, his language implies that he does so, not that parents may not pay what they would otherwise have had to pay, but that children may learn who would not otherwise have learnt.” But the lapse of time and alterations made by the Court of Chancery or other authority had altered the position and effect of the old foundations. “Neither representing what their founders meant them to be, nor fulfilling any useful purpose now, many of the schools founded three centuries ago seem to stand as warnings of the fate which must befall foundations that are not wisely adapted to the change of times.”¹

The organ for making the requisite changes, he held strongly, should not be the Court of Chancery. The reforms were rather matters of policy and common sense than of law, and large discretionary powers were absolutely required in order to consider not only each trust for itself, but each in relation to others over a considerable district. Such powers ought to be vested in Provincial Boards under an enlarged Charity Commission.² Dr. Temple was very desirous of enlisting as far as possible local knowledge and local feeling. And when, after much discussion, the Commissioners had almost decided to abandon the idea of County or Provincial Boards on account of the difficulty of creating such as should be satisfactory, he lent a ready ear to the suggestion of the secretary that the matter should be examined afresh, and encouraged the circulation among the Commissioners of a paper drawn by the secretary for the purpose. Provincial Boards were accordingly proposed in the Report.

Direct election (said Dr. Temple) would be the truest means of securing that living force which in this country has always proved in the end the most trustworthy guarantee of permanent activity and efficiency. But it might be doubted

¹ Sch. Inq. Com. Rep. pp. 572-575.

² *Ibid.* pp. 632-637.

whether an intelligent interest in the subject is at present sufficiently general to enable the people at large to take the management of schools so entirely into their own hands. It was better, therefore, for the present to recommend that Provincial Boards should be constituted of six or eight unpaid district commissioners, appointed by the Crown from residents in the division, and of one paid commissioner, who should personally inspect every endowed secondary school at least once in three years and make a thorough report of it, besides presiding over the annual examination of the schools.¹

Towards the conclusion of the Report he again insisted on the paramount importance of securing the goodwill of the people.

Every arrangement which fosters the interest of the people in the schools, which teaches the people to look on the schools as their own, which encourages them to take a share in the management, will do at least as much service as the wisest advice and the most skilful administration. Force can only be obtained by trusting the schools to the hearty goodwill of the people.²

The Report of the Schools Inquiry Commission was published in March 1868. Mr. Gladstone came into office at the end of the year; Mr. Forster was made Vice-President of the Council, and on his motion a Bill for reforming the endowed schools was, after careful discussion by a select committee of the Commons, passed in the session of 1869. The Bill originally contained another part providing for examination of schools and registration of teachers. There was not time in the session for this second part, and it was withdrawn, but formed the subject of considerable discussion among schoolmasters, Mr. Forster being inclined to bring it forward again another year. It was amended and reprinted as a separate Bill

¹ Sch. Inq. Com. Rep. pp. 638, 639. The area proposed was a Registrar-General's Division, with power to counties to have each a Board of their own. See above.

² *Ibid.* pp. 658, 659. The Report says "Energy." Dr. Temple's word was "force."

(called 'Endowed Schools Bill, No. 2). In this shape it applied to all the endowed schools in England and Wales, above the elementary, and included seven¹ of the public schools which had been the subject of an earlier commission. Dr. Temple was strongly in favour of such a Bill,² but very desirous that the examinations of schools should be compulsory and annual, so as to fit in with the school's regular work, and that they should aim at testing the work of the boys rather than the work of the masters. He thought that in the larger schools, say with more than 300 scholars, the masters should be invited to take part in the examination, and in all schools the endeavour should be made to follow the work of the school and not to impose an external curriculum. The Central Board should be friendly and sympathetic to the schoolmasters, and especially at the start invite their suggestions for the time and manner of the examination. Probably only the top half of the school should be thus examined. About ten shillings per examinee would have to be paid by the highest schools; others would cost less. In private schools all examinations would be voluntary, and examinations in religious subjects voluntary in all schools.

For the registration of teachers the Bill as amended proposed that only registered teachers should be eligible to teach in an endowed school, except for a period not exceeding one year, and that a degree in honours at an English University or a certificate of the Committee of Council should entitle the holder to registration, as much as the

¹ Merchant Taylors' School appeared to be the property of the Company, and St. Paul's was the subject of a claim by the Mercers Company (who, however, eventually failed in their suit). Hence the nine schools were reduced to seven.

² Some correspondence on the subject of the Bill, in February 1869, between Mr. Harper, the headmaster of Sherborne School, and Dr. Temple, is published in Mr. Lester's *Life of the former*, pp. 69-85.

Educational Council's certificate after their own examination.

The schoolmasters who practically represented the case of the leading schools in the correspondence with Mr. Forster and the secretary of the Commission were the headmasters of Marlborough and Sherborne, Mr. Bradley and Mr. H. D. Harper. The former somewhat reluctantly assented to the Bill in its final shape, the latter with considerable readiness.

When Bishop of London, Dr. Temple gave evidence before Mr. Bryce's Secondary Education Commission¹ on July 6, 1894. His evidence is given in vol. ii. of their report. On some of the machinery suggested for organising secondary education his recommendations were, of course, affected by the establishment of County Councils and the development of higher grade schools in connexion with the elementary schools. But in other respects he maintained his former views, *e.g.* against making secondary education free except to selected boys, and in favour of providing a system of exhibitions to be gained by competitive examination. When asked whether the intimate knowledge on the part of examiners and teachers of the boys within the school should enter into the decision, he replied "that he should not object to the masters reporting how the boy acquitted himself in form through a certain period, but he should object very much to a boy's goodness of character being taken into account."²

The review which has thus been given of Dr. Temple's opinions on educational matters has been for brevity's sake necessarily limited both in the subjects dealt with, in the details, and in the

¹ See letter from the Right Honourable J. Bryce, M.P., Editor's Supplement, vol. ii. p. 648.—Ed.

² Sec. Educ. Commission, Rep. Evid. vol. ii. Q. 3898.


reasons.* But so far as it goes it may be taken as a trustworthy summary. In many respects the opinions are very indicative of character. He was a clergyman, but recognised fully the differences of opinion in the nation at large and the comprehensiveness of the Church of England. He had been a Government officer and inspector, and always thought that he had himself benefited greatly by his experience in that capacity ; but while highly valuing competent external examination and inspection, he had no wish for English secondary education being made stiff and uniform by bureaucratic methods and aims. He had had opportunities of looking at education, not in one or two schools only, but in many, and was thus saved from the temptation of regarding only the interest of one locality and one type, and could take a wide view of what the nation had got, and what it required to get. He had had a hard training as a boy, and had felt it strengthen his character and teach him that wealth might do much, but that industry and native force would do much more. He had taken high honours at Oxford in mathematics as well as classics, and while highly appreciating the more humanistic culture of the latter, and regarding Latin as a valuable link of schools both to one another and to the Universities, was ready to admit physical science, and had a strong belief in arithmetic both for its practical and educational uses and as an excellent examination test. And perhaps it is not quite fanciful to connect his constant advocacy of parents' wishes, parents' scruples, and parents' right to share in the control of schools with his own strong and tender affection for his mother and his gratitude for her care.¹

¹ Some additional particulars, on the more personal side, as to the Kneller Hall period and Mr. Temple's connexion with the University. Local Examinations will be found in the Editor's Supplement, vol. ii. chap. ii. "Discipline."—En.

RUGBY MEMOIR

1857—1869

**By FRANCIS ELLIOTT KITCHENER, Assistant Master
at Rugby, 1862—1875**



Headmaster of Rugby

Portrait of the Headmaster

Headmaster of Rugby
1884

J. Ample

CHAPTER I

APPOINTMENT TO RUGBY

Election—Condition of the school—Dr. Goulburn.

ON November 12, 1857, the Trustees of the Rugby Charity ordered that "the Reverend Frederick Temple, M.A., be and is hereby appointed Headmaster of Rugby School, in the room of the Reverend Dr. Goulburn, resigned."¹

The idea was no new one to Mr. Temple. As far back as the time when Mr. Tait was about to leave Rugby for the Deanery of Carlisle, it had been pressed upon Mr. Temple that he ought to stand for the Headmastership. In his speech in Convocation in February 1903,² Archbishop Davidson stated that in 1849 Mr. Tait was asked by the Trustees to name to them the man who he thought ought to be his successor. On this he wrote to Mr. Temple, then at Kneller Hall, and told him his wish that he should succeed him. Mr. Temple wrote a long letter in reply, refusing at that time to stand; there was no post on earth, he said, that,

¹ Extract from the minutes of the Trustees. The Trustees present were Lord Denbigh, Lord Leigh, Lord Aylesford, Lord John Scott, Sir H. St. J. Halford, Sir C. B. Adderley, and Mr. H. C. Wise; of these only the late Lord Leigh and Sir C. B. Adderley (the late Lord Norton) survived Dr. Temple.

² *Guardian*, February 25, 1903, p. 275. Upper House of Convocation. (The letter from which Archbishop Davidson quoted is now unfortunately lost, but I have the Archbishop's authority for stating that what was said by Mr. Temple in the letter was quite accurately stated by him in Convocation.—F. E. K.)

as it seemed to him, he would so much like to fill, but for the present at least he was giving his life to the education of elementary school teachers, and therefore he asked that his name should not be put forward.

As a result the election lay between Dr. Goulburn, afterwards Dean of Norwich, an Etonian, and Mr. Lake, afterwards Dean of Durham, a Rugbeian, and supported by the Arnoldite tradition. The choice of the Trustees on that occasion fell on Dr. Goulburn.

In 1857 another chance occurred of securing "the post on earth" that Mr. Temple would most like to fill; again his friends pressed him to stand, and this time circumstances were different; Kneller Hall had been closed in December 1855, and the tie that bound him to a duty from which "most persons at the time were disposed to dissuade him"¹ had been dissolved. Dr. Tait,² now Bishop of London, renewed his pressure:—

I have no hesitation (he wrote to the Trustees) in saying that I am acquainted with no man in England so fit for it as he.

But the most striking feature of the testimony which his friends gave of his fitness for the post was the constantly recurring prophecy that, by similarity of character, he would do for Rugby the work of another Arnold.

The appointment of Mr. Temple (writes Mr. Lingen) would mark an epoch in the public education of this country not less notable than that which followed the appointment of Dr. Arnold.

¹ Testimonials; Mr. R. R. W. Lingen, then Secretary to the Committee of the Privy Council on Education, the late Lord Lingen, the first representative of the Rugby masters on the reformed Governing Body under the Act of 1868.

² Testimonials; Dr. A. C. Tait, then Bishop of London, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury.

Stanley, the biographer of Arnold, Arthur Clough, the Rugby poet and close college friend of Mr. Temple, and Matthew Arnold, representing the former time, and J. C. Shairp¹ and Charles Arnold,² representing the existing staff of masters, join in chorus :—

In the most important qualities of a schoolmaster (writes Dr. Arnold's son), in the union of piety, energy, and cheerfulness, in the faculty of governing the young, in the power of commanding at once the respect and the affection of those under his charge, Mr. Temple, more than any other man whom I have ever known, resembles, to the best of my observation and judgment, my late father.³

The future Headmaster might well have taken heart from these testimonials, but, with characteristic self-control, he never even read them.⁴ For Rugby, therefore, he stood, and to Rugby he came.

The Rugby of the fifties was in the trough of the wave; it still had behind it the impetus of a great past, which carried it on despite a certain want of harmony between the existing *régime* and the days of Arnold and Tait. In Dr. Goulburn it had for its chief a master, as his biographer says,⁵ "free from the liberalising associations of recent Rugby," and, despite the inherent goodness of the man, the popularity of the school, as judged by the pressure of boys entering, had diminished.

¹ J. C. Shairp, master, 1846-57; at this time Shairp had already gone to St. Andrews to take up his professorship there, but he writes to Temple (November 16, 1857): "You know I am still a Rugby master, and have till Christmas to decide whether I stay here or return. If I see my way here I don't think I shall return, though I much regret not to have a year or more of work with you. How I should have hailed your advent a year or two earlier."

² C. T. Arnold, master, 1841-78.

³ Testimonials; Mr. Matthew Arnold, then Professor of Poetry at Oxford.

⁴ Miss Temple, in 1867, while showing the original testimonials to a guest at the Schoolhouse, told her that Dr. Temple had never seen them.

⁵ Rev. B. Compton's *Memoir of Dean Goulburn*, 1. 37.

Under the older headmasters, Ingles and¹ Wooll, the school had several times approached 400; Arnold had kept the school down by limiting the number of boys not on the foundation; under Tait the restriction had been removed, and the numbers had become little short of 500, but by 1856 they had fallen again to about 300.

It is always difficult to account for the ebb and flow of a school. The morale of the school was still sound; the masters remarkable for teaching power; the list of honours can bear comparison with almost any epoch; and yet the school had gone down.

Often in later days in private talk, and notably on one public occasion at Rugby, Dr. Temple bore testimony to the impress of his own personal character which his predecessor had left on the school:—

I remember well (Archbishop Temple said),¹ when unveiling in Rugby Chapel a memorial window to Dr. Goulburn, how deeply I was struck, after I had been here a very short time, with the deep religious impression that he (Dr. Goulburn) had made upon the whole school, and especially on the Sixth Form. . . . When he went away there were not a few who loved him well; and since that time not a few have learnt to look back upon the teaching that he gave them with deep gratitude that so true and really heavenly minded a man should have once taken such a part in influencing their lives.

In this recognition of Dr. Goulburn's personal character, all who knew Rugby in the fifties will fully join; but undoubtedly the school in general felt the want of a stronger hand in discipline, and of a more reforming spirit in organisation, while the Sixth Form turned to the more trenchant teachers among the assistant masters for the intellectual stimulus which they failed to get from the Headmaster.

¹ October 1, 1898.

Thus then, while the Headmaster's influence was centred in the chapel, the power of the tutor-rooms had over-asserted itself. T. S. Evans, the dear old "Tom" of many a Rugby story, and E. W. Benson,¹ marvellous in his attraction to the elder boys, were the Headmaster's lieutenants in the classical teaching of the Sixth; while the housemasters, such as G. G. Bradley, Charles Evans, and Robert Mayor,² were, as it were, barons under a mediæval king; the housemaster had grown to be an *imperium in imperio*.

Radical reform in financial matters was greatly required; the existing scale of salaries had grown up without regard to a fair distribution of income among the older and the younger men. The school buildings were adapted to classical teaching only, and there were no special rooms for teachers of other subjects, although Rugby had been one of the first public schools to introduce subjects other than pure classics.

The curriculum required reorganisation; it was still possible for a boy to get through three years at the school without a single lesson in French or in science.³

At the time of coming to Rugby to take up this great work, Frederick Temple was in the prime of life; he completed his thirty-sixth year nine days after his appointment to Rugby. No wonder that the widow of Dr. Wooll, the last Headmaster but three, expressed her disappointment, when he called upon her, at not seeing a more elderly man. How were the mighty fallen, from the bewigged if less sturdy figure of the Headmaster of her remembrance! To Rugby Mr.

¹ T. S. Evans, master, 1847-62; E. W. Benson, 1852-58.

² G. G. Bradley, 1846-58; C. Evans, 1848-62; R. B. Mayor, 1845-63.

³ I speak from my own experience. French was not taught above the Middle School, and no boy could learn German as well as science.

Temple brought with him his widowed 'mother. The beauty of the relationship that existed between mother and son taught a lasting lesson to all that had the good fortune to enter the inner circle of the Schoolhouse. With her, too, there came Miss Jennetta Octavia Temple, the youngest of his sisters, his senior by two years, who, throughout his mastership, managed the household, and exercised over those who came in contact with her at the Schoolhouse an influence differing in kind from that of her brother, but sensibly affecting the welfare of the school.

CHAPTER II

HEADMASTER AND BOYS

Reminiscences by Mr. H. Lee Warner, Mr. B. E. Hammond, the Rev. Arthur Butler—Dr. Temple's views as to the curriculum of a public school.

INTO such a school, strongly mastered, and yet worked at great waste of power, confusedly and unequally financed, and yet with great possibilities, and with all the depression of falling numbers and the financial loss caused by emptying boarding-houses, came the new Headmaster.

Since Rugby had trembled, as tradition still has it, at the advent of a young man of the name of Arnold who was to "change the face of education all through the public schools of England,"¹ there had been no such fluttering of the dovescotes as preceded Mr. Temple's coming. His reception shall be given in the words of one of the Sixth-Form boys of the Schoolhouse² :—

Two testimonies from very different quarters had somewhat modified the distrust I felt of my future Headmaster in 1857, a distrust which arose from the fact that he was not Dr. Goulburn's choice, and from a vague rumour which trickled into the passages of the Schoolhouse that he was determined to level down Rugby to the position of less-known grammar schools. The first of these testimonies

¹ Stanley's *Life of Dr. Arnold*, p. 42 (7th ed.).

² Henry Lee Warner : boy, 1854-60 ; master, 1864-85.

was given by Canon Stanley, as he then was, of Canterbury, who, on my announcing to him, with full assurance of sympathy, that Rugby was going to lose Dr. Goulburn, had replied at once—"Then now you will have the best Headmaster in England, Mr. Temple of Balliol." This was confirmed in the course of my going home for the holidays, when I met a pupil-teacher from the National School at Walsingham, who accosted me with the statement that I was going to have as my Headmaster his old Principal at Kneller Hall.¹

I had seen Mr. Temple between these two occasions, having paid a visit to Dr. Goulburn's study with that object decently veiled, and had intercepted the outgoing and incoming Headmasters at the foot of the Schoolhouse stairs. The one, dignified, sweet-voiced, cassocked, almost pompous; the other with a wide shirt-front, a rasping voice, and an elastic spring as he bounded up the stairs; what a contrast! a contrast almost altogether unfavourable to my young mind. Yet this latter was destined in a few weeks to take possession of my heart as of so many others, and to hold it with an ever deeper awe and reverence for the rest of our two lives.

But that did not come at once. On the first night of the new term, as we were gathered for evening prayers at the Schoolhouse, some sixty of us sitting, as the custom then was, on the tables, with our feet on the forms, while the Sixth called us over, there entered, carrying his own candlestick, instead of being preceded by a butler to bow reverentially as his master passed into the hall, our new Doctor-to-be; and, with one look of surprise at the attitude of his future pupils, instantly calmed as he saw the grave look of the Sixth awaiting him at high table, began prayers at once. Prayers over, we stood up to wait for our housemaster to pass out first, which he did, only saying, simply: "I hope we shall soon come to know one another well. Good-night." This was our first introduction.

We soon found that we had to do with a strong and humorous man, absolutely fair and simple in method, as penetrating as truth itself in his judgments; and, though it was remarked playfully that his alpaca gown would be the better if it caught less often in the coal-barrow as he hurried

¹ An anecdote from this conversation is given by Mr. Roby in the previous Memoir, p. 101, note 2.—Ed.

into school, we felt his natural dignity, and the era of hero-worship soon set in. Rumour there was, too, of his having told the new boys who arrived at the House on that first night, that he "could run a hundred yards, climb a tree, or jump a brook with any of them"; and the first idea, that our new Headmaster was bragging, was soon dispelled by the report that he had climbed many of the elms in the Close after locking up.

The rumour to which Mr. Lee Warner alludes was by no means a false one. In after-years Dr. Temple would tell the story of how he had been struck, on his arrival, at the temptation which the old elms in the Close offered to any one fond of climbing, and the danger which the manifest insecurity of some of them threatened to the boy who succumbed to the temptation. So before issuing an edict on the matter, he went out under cover of the gloaming, and climbed every tree in succession. A further illustration of Dr. Temple's climbing propensities is given in the *Life of Archbishop Benson*,¹ where Mr. Penny, of Wellington College, is quoted as writing:—

Benson was very fond of taking his guests to see it (a magnificent beech-tree at Wellington College) and took an early opportunity of showing it to Temple. Temple admired it very much, and, after looking at it for some time close at hand and at a distance, cried out to Benson, "I can't resist the temptation—look out!" and before Benson could turn round, Temple had made a rush and a leap, and was scrambling up the bole of the tree. In a few seconds Temple had succeeded in reaching the first stage whence the magnificent limbs diverge in all directions, and was grinning with delight at his success.

No doubt the great physical strength which their master was known to have at command was to his boys one of the first sources of attraction. They looked with wonder at the stride of a man

¹ *The Life of Edward White Benson*, vol. i. p. 185.

who could walk eighteen miles in three hours. There was nothing about him of the modern athlete: it was merely that it came naturally to him to be strong in body as he was in mind, and the cricket or football player felt himself in the presence of one who knew all about the athlete's craft, and could hold his own with him there as in other things. To resume Mr. Lee Warner's recollections:—

It is hard, at this distance of time, to describe what he was as a teacher or form-master. He took the whole Sixth Form together for many lessons, where now it is divided under two or three masters; and he often seemed indifferent to practices the ordinary master would not tolerate, or to ignorance of lessons which should have been prepared. I remember on one occasion the blade of a knife, with which I was rounding an R on my little table, flying on to his book as he sat not far off, and his merely remarking, "That will keep you attentive now." But I felt the look of his keen eyes as he said it. Often, too, he would put on a boy to translate a passage which he had obviously not prepared, and would be content with exposing him to the humiliation of revealing his ignorance, and keeping the whole form waiting a quarter of an hour for release to breakfast. If the culprit was an athlete, he would illustrate his failure by some well-remembered mistake some days before in the cricket or football field. His own translations were even, if not brilliant.

Probably the best effect of his teaching was the impression he created of the general character of an author's meaning and style, and of the possibility of mastering it. But the analyses of chapters and books which he made in our presence were the most masterly and illuminating weapons he used for our instruction. Whether it was Lucretius or Thucydides, Guizot or de Tocqueville, Plato or St. Paul, it was marvellous how it all fell into shape in our minds; and, in the same way, if he was looking over an essay, *e.g.* on the advantages of Narrow-mindedness or the Possible Results of Hannibal's Victory, he would sum up with encouraging lucidity. It was curious that a man, who himself had learned Euclid from his mother, who never professed to understand it, was never weary of insisting on the danger of

teaching boys too much at a time. "All your questions are too hard," he would say to his young masters. "Why do you frighten your boys so?" he once said in their very presence to a new arrival who prided himself on his powers of discipline. His method of teaching was to create an impression of ease in the task, whilst carefully disentangling all the difficulties. Perhaps the atmosphere of serenity and cheerfulness in which we did our work gave Rugby boys that excess of confidence which has sometimes been urged against them. But it made the passage from lessons to leisure less obvious, and encouraged us to listen to our Doctor's instruction as willingly in the Close or the drawing-room, where he was backed by the intelligence of Miss Temple, as in the library.¹ And what did he not make interesting to us? Whether he was discussing the claims of the House of York as against Dr. Kennedy, who was a "strong Lancastrian"; or the findings of the Public School Commission with W. E. Forster or Theodore Walrond; or game laws; or University tests; or the causes of the American Civil War; or relating his experiences at Balliol under Dr. Jenkyns; or an account of his walk from Oxford to Rugby, where Dr. Arnold's butler had almost dismissed him as a tramp, had it not been for Arthur Stanley's interference,—he took pains to amuse his youthful guests, and threw a halo of impartiality around every question he dealt with. His hearers stood on the threshold of life, and were made to feel that that life was worth living.

The three things that I associate most in my mind with those days of our great Headmaster are his cheerfulness, his thoroughness, and his impartiality. I used occasionally to take walks with him, and I would sometimes ask a question which produced a long silence. How I dreaded those silences! They set me to wonder whether I had asked a wrong question, or asked it wrongly; when, suddenly, he would begin to answer, having arranged his thoughts, and having also secured that mine were in order. Questions on religious subjects he would often answer by a quotation, notably from Clough's poems, among which he was specially fond of the lines—

It fortifies my soul to know
That, though I perish, Truth is so :

¹ The old library was then the Sixth Form school.

That, howsoe'er I stray and range,
Whate'er I do, Thou dost not change.
I steadier step when I recall
That, if I slip, Thou dost not fall.¹

Or, as he would sum it up, "I am sure that as long as you can get along with broad, simple truths, you are quite right to keep to them." At other times he would break off into talk on farming, butter-making, and his boyish experiences on the furrows, though he very seldom talked of himself.

It was marvellous how he found time to do other things besides his school work. The mother who was too poor to hire a nurse to lift her sick son will testify how he came day after day, as soon as he discovered her need, to the Bilton Road, after his third lesson with the Sixth, to do it for her. The Rugby cobbler who believed in total abstinence found an Oxford First-Class man who allowed him, after some years of argument, to convince him that it was his duty to abstain also. The working-man who wished to start a Land Society found a ready welcome and a ready-made sketch of rules in the Doctor's study. The Local Board that thought they understood water-supply, being practical men, found that an ounce of theory might be well mixed with pounds of experience. The Liberal candidate felt himself reproved in the presence of a man who made a party nobler whilst he repudiated its methods.

It all seemed so easy in those days. He took everything in his stride, as he had done his eighteen Welsh miles in three hours before breakfast. It is only as time has gone on and his pupils have met the insincerity, the hurry, and the ineffectiveness of the world, that they have realised what it was early in life to come across a strenuous, unprofessing, steady worker, who took his work as a matter of course, because he was rooted on a rock of self-repression and conviction. But to leave Rugby was not to lose him; the laborious fidelity with which he kept up with his old pupils by correspondence at Rugby itself, and afterwards, when he had exchanged Rugby for his bishoprics or archbishopric, is attested by the literary stores of many an old Rugbeian.

¹ *Clough's Poems*, p. 76. The tie between Temple and Clough was close: to the end of his life Temple used a pocket Virgil that had been Clough's, and at the end of which was written, in the poet's own hand, two stanzas of his earliest poem, "Come back again, my olden heart," with some variations from the received text.

Let us turn back from recollections which have carried us on somewhat beyond the early days of the headmastership.

The following account of the teaching is by H. G. Hart,¹ afterwards Headmaster of Sedbergh :—

For two years and a half I had the privilege of being in the Sixth Form at Rugby under Dr. Temple, and of seeing and hearing him day by day as he taught us classics, divinity, history, geography, or mathematics. Of what that privilege was some of us at least had a dim consciousness at the time; few probably had more than that. But forty years, while they have dulled the recollection of many details, which I would gladly recall for the purposes of this sketch, have only cleared my perceptions of his greatness as a man, to which so much of his greatness as a teacher was due.

It was generally believed, and I have heard it asserted on what seemed to be good authority, that Dr. Temple, on being appointed to the headmastership of Rugby, immediately set himself the task of reading through all the classical authors that ever enter into a school curriculum. The statement will not seem improbable to those who have realised by constant intercourse with him his love of work, and his power of accomplishing it rapidly. Perhaps he did not quite realise himself how great that power was, or how small a share of it was possessed by some of us. At any rate, our classical lessons were long; 120 lines of a Greek play,² for instance, or several pages of Cicero or of Plato. He knew that minute points of scholarship were being attended to by many of our private tutors, and by the incomparable scholar³ who had the bulk of the composition in his hands; consequently, he doubtless felt safe in hurrying us forward at a speed that enabled us to gain that which is so often lost in classical work at school, namely, a general comprehension of a treatise or a play, though he might thereby be taxing the powers of the slower thinkers to the

¹ Henry George Hart, boy, 1858-62; afterwards Master at Harrow and Headmaster of Sedbergh.

² Another old Rugbeian adds: "It was a marvellous thing to hear him take the Choephoree, just a simple text, without a note except a reference here and there in his beautiful writing, and translate it just as it stood, with a complete disregard of emendations."

³ Thomas Sanders Evans, master, 1847-62; afterwards Professor of Greek in Durham University.

utmost, or even causing them to drop out of the race for a time. Perhaps the lessons that left the deepest impression upon the Sixth Form were those in divinity and history. In these, as in the classical lessons, he carried his hearers along rapidly, and of necessity left behind the inattentive or the incompetent. But if a boy had even average ability and a real desire to learn, he had great opportunities. Everything in these lessons—or rather lectures, for a question was seldom, if ever, put to the Form during them—was clearly and succinctly expressed, and might reasonably have been judged intelligible to every member of the Form. If, however, a boy, whether by his own fault or not, failed to keep up with the teacher, he might not get another chance of recovering what he had missed, for the pace was too great to allow of much repetition.

On the whole, the Form attended well. Our reverence and love for the man were so great that we required no other stimulus to fix our minds on all that fell from his lips. And we had no other stimulus, for Dr. Temple never seemed consciously to aim at arousing our interest and engaging our attention. Other teachers might resort to vigilance or severity in order to ensure the latter; to exciting tales or dramatic display to secure the former. He simply poured forth his thoughts in a mighty stream, which, while it might leave a few stranded on the shore, carried the main body of the Form with it.

His lectures on the Old and New Testaments were simple, graphic, and suggestive; but deeply as he could stir our hearts in the pulpit, he seldom used the divinity lesson as an opportunity for a sermon. I feel sure that this was due to that chivalrous reluctance to excite our emotions which was so noticeable in him. In chapel, of course, it was otherwise. There he must needs utter the deepest thoughts that were in his heart; and he uttered them—often with the tears streaming down his face—in a manner that went straight to the hearts of his hearers. But school was not chapel, and there I believe that he refrained of set purpose, and sometimes probably not without effort, from giving full vent to his feelings. His aim in school, if I understand it rightly, was primarily to instruct us, and to appeal to our intelligence rather than to our emotions.

In the history lessons he discarded the shorter text-books (which, however, were few in those days) in favour of such works as Robertson's *Charles the Fifth*, or Motley's *Dutch*

Republic. In these, as in the classical work, our lessons were long, and we were asked few questions. Hence it depended on ourselves whether we read the text diligently or not. The lesson consisted of a masterly analysis, dictated by Dr. Temple slowly enough to be written down by those who were in earnest. We ought to have supplemented it by a careful re-perusal of the text in the light shed by the orderly arrangement of events and arguments provided by the analysis. But it must be confessed that few of us found time to make this use of our notebooks, at any rate, until the half-yearly examination was impending. Dr. Temple, however, was not satisfied with books of history pure and simple. During the years that I was in the Form I remember that we read much of Blackstone's *Commentaries*, and of de Tocqueville's *Democracy in America*, both of which, under his powerful handling, were charged full with interest for us, and undoubtedly widened our ideas and stimulated our intelligence.

I was asked to write down my recollections of Dr. Temple as a teacher, and I have attempted to accomplish the task ; but I find it impossible in his case to dissociate the teacher from the man. It was because he was so great a man that he exercised such power as a teacher. Forty years ago Robert Browning was only just becoming known, and none of us, perhaps, had seen his poems. But few in the Sixth Form, I venture to think, when first they read the lines—

We that had loved him so, followed him, honoured him,
Lived in his mild and magnificent eye,
Learned his great language, caught his clear accents,
Made him our pattern to live and to die !¹—

could have failed to see in them, drawn with startling fidelity, the image of another Leader, who will never be lost to those whom he once led.

Probably it was his masterly power of analysing a difficult author that made the deepest impression on the Sixth. Mr. B. E. Hammond² writes as follows :—

¹ Browning's *Lyrics*, "The Lost Leader."

² Boy, 1856-61 ; afterwards Historical Lecturer at Trinity College, Cambridge.

You ask me how Temple impressed me in his work as a teacher. I think he was the greatest teacher I ever knew among living men. He taught us methods of teaching ourselves. Every teacher worthy of the name makes his pupils desire to teach themselves: Temple showed his pupils how to do it. He used to analyse every didactic or historical work that we read in Form, whether it was Plato's *Philebus*, or Cicero's *Tusculan Questions*, or Hallam's *Constitutional History*, or Thucydides, or Herodotus, or Livy; and boys could learn how to analyse any other work. The subjects that he set for essays sometimes related to extremely difficult questions: as "Nihil est in intellectu nisi quod prius fuit in sensu"; or "The unity of a science lies in the idea from which it starts, the unity of an art in the object at which it aims" (he set these two while I was in his Form). In commenting on my essays weekly, he was admirable in exposing any inconsequence in thought, or wobbling in the meaning of words.

This power of analysing an author lay at the base of his classical as well as of his other teaching. In teaching Latin prose there was the same manly grip; he brushed aside what was unimportant in the passage to be translated, and went straight to the heart of the sense, putting it in the fewest possible words.

His teaching of history left a deep impression on his boys, not only from the clearness of his knowledge and the analysis of facts, but from the broad view which he took of the world's progress, and his recognition of that which was truly great.

So, too, his lessons on the Bible were an epoch in the education of the Sixth; they were not made, as Mr. Hart has told us, to take the place of his chapel teaching, but they were a revelation of what the Bible really was, and gave to the study of the Old and New Testaments a new reverence and a new hope.

Still, amid all this appreciation there is a consensus of agreement among those who knew his teaching well, that Dr. Temple had not the qualities

of an ideal classical teacher. This goes some way to justify the criticisms that were current at the time at the Universities as to Temple's rough-and-ready scholars. "If," to quote Dr. Jex Blake,¹ "Arnold had not Temple's positive shrewdness, Temple had not Arnold's consummate literary taste and skill." Nevertheless, from the evidence of his pupils, it would appear that insight was as much his characteristic as shrewdness.

So, too, Mr. Arthur Butler,² who, as house-tutor, was in close contact with the Schoolhouse Sixth in the early days of his headmastership, writes with some qualification :—

Possibly he never became a really great teacher in the highest sense. His moral force was more remarkable than his literary or scholastic enthusiasm. He was more of the statesman and ruler dealing with things present, than the man of imagination transporting his hearers into times long passed away. He was most effective in divinity and history lessons: I remember how the Sixth felt the power and stirring influence of his lectures on St. John; and I remember also how he spoke of Thucydides' history of the Syracusan expedition, as "bringing a lump into one's throat; you could hardly get through it."

So, again, Archdeacon E. G. Sandford, in his address on Dr. Temple to the present generation of Rugby boys, admits³ :—

Perhaps there were some limitations here: he had not, I think, the stimulating power of Bradley as a classical teacher: nor Benson's delicacy of intellectual touch; nor did he inspire on the literary side; but his broad, human treatment of intellectual subjects was a death-blow to pedantry, and it held out a hope of mental salvation even to the dull. Moreover, it broadened the intellectual interest and outlook of

¹ Sermon in Wells Cathedral, Christmas Day, 1902.

² Arthur Gray Butler, boy, 1844-50; master, 1858-62; afterward, Headmaster of Haileybury.

³ Address on Dr. Temple in New Boys' School, Rugby, by E. G. Sandford, Archdeacon of Exeter, 1903, p. 9.

the pupil in many ways. There is many a man now living who first learnt from Temple an interest in politics on their wider side; a sympathy with social problems, or rather, shall I say, sympathy with the conditions of the lives of poor people; who first learnt from him to be keen for progress and yet to reverence continuity in national life; first learnt from him to love history, but to search it rather for principles than precedents; first learnt from him resolutely to look at both sides of a question before making up the mind, and with equal resolution to stand to the conviction when the judgment was formed; from him we learnt to keep the judgment it may be in lifelong suspense on doubtful points, while all the time holding to and walking by the light that was given; to be in bondage to no party allegiance; and to reverence conscience as the voice of God.

And if in his teaching Dr. Temple realised all this, he reached his own ideal: scholar, mathematician, and keen student of science as he was, he yet felt that the object of the highest teaching was to teach not about words or things, but about men. He could teach the highest mathematical set of the Sixth how to get out geometrical problems in a way that few specialists could have done; but yet he realised the limitations of mathematical teaching. He could recognise that "the perfect and peculiar beauty of the classical literature will always put it at head of all other," and yet he would not let a classical lesson degenerate into a mere discussion of grammatical hair-splitting. What he set before himself as the object of his classical lessons at this time is clearly set forth in one of his answers to the Royal Commissioners in 1861¹ :—

It is an accident, but I think a most fortunate accident, that in England the study thus chosen to take the lead in our highest education has been that of the classics.

I should not be prepared to maintain that the only possible system of education for all results in this country is one based on the classics. But I assume that the schools


¹ Public Schools Commission, 1884, vol. ii. ; Answers, p. 311.

commonly called the public schools are to aim at the highest kind of education; and to give that education, I think the classics decidedly the best instrument. When we have to choose between literature, mathematics, and physical science, the plea advanced on behalf of the two latter is utility. They supply a man with tools for future work. Man's chief business, it is said, is to subdue nature to his purposes, and these two studies show him how. Those who use this plea seem to forget that the world in which we live consists quite as much of the men and women on its surface as of the earth and its constituent materials. If any man were to analyse his own life, he would find that he had far more to do with his fellow-men than with anything else. And if, therefore, we are to choose a study which shall pre-eminently fit a man for life, it will be that which shall best enable him to enter into the thoughts, the feelings, the motives of his fellows.

The real defect of mathematics and physical science as instruments of education is that they have not any tendency to humanise. Such studies do not make a man more human, but simply more intelligent. Physical science, besides giving knowledge, cultivates to some degree the love of order and beauty. Mathematics give a very admirable discipline in precision of thought. But neither of them can touch the strictly human part of our nature. The fact is that all education really comes from intercourse with other minds. The desire to supply bodily needs and to get bodily comforts would prompt even a solitary human being (if he lived long enough) to acquire some rude knowledge of nature. But this would not make him more of a man. That which supplies the perpetual spur to the whole human race to continue incessantly adding to our stores of knowledge, that which refines and elevates and does not educate merely the moral, nor merely the intellectual faculties, but the whole man, is our communion with each other; and the highest study is that which most promotes this communion by enlarging its sphere, by correcting and purifying its influences, by giving perfect and pure models of what ordinary experience can, for the most part, only show in adulterated and imperfect forms. . . . So far as the study selected can influence the result (and it would be absurd to deny that its influence must be great), that study will do so most which most familiarises a boy's mind with noble thoughts, with beautiful images, with the deeds and the

words which great men have done and said, and all others have admired and loved.

This was the ideal Mr. Temple set before himself as a teacher at Rugby. The words were weighty then, and they are weighty now. It may be well that they be considered before reasons of utility and economy have ousted the study of classics from every grammar school in the country.



RUGBY.

CHAPTER III

DR. TEMPLE AND THE MASTERS

Recollections of the Rev. Arthur Butler, Dr. Jex Blake, Mr. E. A. Scott, Canon J. M. Wilson—Masters' Meetings.

FROM the impression Mr. Temple made on the boys, let us turn to that which he made upon his colleagues. Some vacancies occurring in the older staff, with the rapid rise in numbers, brought several new masters in the early years. Among the first appointments were two old Rugbeians, T. W. Jex Blake, who in his turn became Headmaster of Rugby; and A. G. Butler, who left in a few years to start Haileybury; J. M. Wilson, the Senior Wrangler of 1859, to whom fell, among other services to Rugby, the first reorganisation of science work in the new laboratory; and J. W. J. Vecqueray, the foreigner whom generations of boys recognised as more than an average Englishman,—excellent choices, and showing that the new master could pick his men well.¹

Some of these shall tell the tale of his earlier years at Rugby; and first should be taken the recollections of Arthur Butler, written down as far back as 1888, at the suggestion of Miss Temple,

¹ T. W. Jex Blake, now Dean of Wells, master, 1858-68; A. G. Butler, afterwards Headmaster of Haileybury, master, 1858-62; J. M. Wilson, now Canon of Worcester, master, 1859-79; J. W. J. Vecqueray, master, 1859-1901.

with a view to such a memoir as the present ; and, though not absolutely a contemporary document, yet put together before the vividness of memory had passed away :—

I remember, as freshly as if it had happened yesterday, my first meeting with Dr. Temple in his study in the Schoolhouse at Rugby, and how at the first sight he took possession of me with his look of power, intelligence, kindness, and good-humour. We conversed a little about the school and my new duties ; and then he left me with the feeling on my part that under him every one must, and would, do his best. His way of training a new master was simple and effective. A few days after his arrival he would go and himself take a class in the master's presence, handling and teaching the Form in a manner which was full of instruction to a new-comer. Above all, I remember how he wakened up the dull and sluggish boys at the bottom, leaving them, in many cases, half-way up the Form, astonished at their own performance. Then, after about three-quarters of an hour, he would leave, and, with a sigh of relief, the sluggish boys began again to gravitate towards the bottom. This process was repeated once or twice more in the first month ; and then he would come in, unexpected as before, and let the master himself take the lesson, while he stood by. Then would probably follow, when the boys were gone, a few questions, remarks, and suggestions from him ; and the new master felt well started, both as to knowledge of the standard expected from his Form, and the way to teach and manage it. Much, of course, remained to learn for many a month and year ; but the lines were drawn, and a feeling of friendly confidence established between the assistant and the headmaster.

In my case the occasion of this last visit is deeply engraven on my memory. It was a very hot day, and I had taken off my master's gown, fault No. 1, which he humorously noticed with an observant smile. Secondly, we had come suddenly on a description of a bridge in Cæsar, a passage full of technical terms difficult even for an advanced scholar. I had not prepared it, and boys and master alike floundered not a little. He said not a word. Suddenly, turning to him in despair, I remarked, "It is very difficult." "Yes," he said, with a merry smile, "it seems so." This was too much. I returned to my task with a savage energy,

and finally landed the Form, myself, and Cæsar's army safely across the river.

During the five years that I served under Dr. Temple, I never remember a time when the confidence and enthusiasm of the masters for their chief slackened for a moment. He was a great administrator. All the various parts of a complicated system were made by him to work easily and comfortably, without hitch or hindrance, so as to give the idea of an intelligent and self-working machine. But he was the active centre of it; and, in teaching us our several parts in the new system, he combined the mastery of detail, common to all successful administration, with a cheery vigour and sympathetic treatment of difficulties which delighted and inspired every one who came about him.

Every one indeed who went to his study was certain of a hearty welcome; and so constant was the stream of visitors that we wondered how he got through his work. But his power of work was enormous. I have seen him during an examination, after sitting up through a whole night, and working for eighteen consecutive hours, as bright and cheerful at the end of it as if he had done nothing. He just passed his hand over his face with a rapid movement, as if rubbing away something, and then turned to you with the usual smile of kindly greeting. 'This constant and unfailing cheeriness in the midst of work, and under great pressure, was his special characteristic. It was partly natural, partly a matter of duty with him. I have heard him preach about it. "A true Christian should be a happy man, and he should show his happiness in his face." This was his teaching, and his example illustrated it. The only thing he ever seemed to wince under was the attempt to rediscuss some past decision. After full debate in a Masters' Meeting, he put a matter aside. It worried him to reconsider it. Tinkering was for old measures, not for new. So I remember, when I was going to Haileybury as Headmaster, how he spoke to me most feelingly, and most weightily, on this subject. "Not to look on, not to look back, to do your best, your very best, each day as it comes, and leave nothing undone that the day will let you do, that was the wisest course. Past and future are alike in God's hands." So he said in words half (as it seemed) self-conscious, half-admonitory, and as he spoke the tears glistened on his cheek. I did not, I was not likely to, forget them. I should say that he had before been speaking of some of life's trials and disappointments,

in the way in which older men will sometimes speak to younger; and so the fire was already kindled, the fountain prepared to flow. And if his object was deeply to impress his hearer, he could not have adopted means more effectual.

It is needless to say how boys appreciated such a character as I have described. When he first came they did not quite understand that one who looked so jolly could be also firm. And I remember the head of the Eleven once pressing upon him with some insistence the request for a holiday, which had already been refused. "I think, —, you did not notice that I had already said, *No*." There was no mistaking the tone of the last word, though the genial look here, as in so many cases often misunderstood, took away the sting. And the story got about, and the Headmaster was understood to be strong as well as kind.¹

In all his dealings with boys he was simply admirable, ruling the school with a light but firm hand, very trustful, very patient, very good-tempered, very just; and relying on moral influences and force of character, rather than on punishment and severity. Punishment, indeed, though often necessary even in small matters, and inexorable as a last resource, came to be regarded by most of us almost as a confession of weakness. "If we had properly impressed boys there would be no need to punish." And so masters would sit in with lazy and dull boys, who had failed in their lessons, to hear them over again, shaming (it was to be hoped) the one and helping the other. Such a method of punishment soon discriminates between the dull and lazy, who are otherwise apt to be confounded. Moreover, in so doing, we were only imitating Dr. Temple. I have known him, when hardly pressed himself, still find time to hear a lazy boy his lesson, day after day, before going into school. He wished to try everything before punishing. Sometimes, possibly, he carried his reluctance to punish too far, at least at the beginning of his Rugby life; but he succeeded to a remarkable extent in giving moral weight to punishment:² and

¹ On another occasion, a boy high up in the school, presuming on a supposed slackening of the reins, was met with the remark, "Conduct like that will alter the relation between us." The rebuke was sufficient.

² An incident recorded by Canon J. H. Crowfoot (boy, 1855-60), in a sermon preached in 1903 in Rugby chapel, illustrates this point: "I had just got," says Mr. Crowfoot, "into the Sixth Form when Dr. Temple came to Rugby. Surely, seldom has there been a man so strong and simple, so tender and true. He always treated us as if we were in

also in making his own feelings of right and wrong generally pervade the school.

Dr. Jex Blake, now Dean of Wells, has also written out for me the recollections of his mastership, which cover a longer period than that of Mr. Butler.¹

Dr. Temple was appointed Headmaster of Rugby, November 1857, and on the day of his appointment I reached England from Rome. Before Christmas, on the resignation of J. C. Shairp and of Berdmore Compton, I was offered and accepted the first vacancy on the Rugby staff. When Dr. Temple came to take up his work at Rugby, he administered, unconsciously, a triple shock to the local mind: walking up from the station—in a swallow-tail coat—carrying his own bag. But rapidly, through school and town alike, his vigour of mind and body, his contagious cheerfulness, his transparent genuineness, his passion for work, and his power of continuous work impressed every one. His religious fervour and preaching power were felt instantly in the school chapel; and very soon he held the school, masters and boys alike, in his hand.

The youngest member of the staff except myself was Edward White Benson, *anima candida*, whom I already knew well; and recognising much difference of type and training between the two men, each so noble and sincere, each destined to be Primate of all England, I was surprised to be told by the younger, "Temple's ideal of the Church of Christ appeals to me strongly; it is truer than Arnold's: I accept it almost entirely." Very soon A. G. Butler joined the staff, and his admiration of Temple was as unbounded as my own. But some decision of the Headmaster—I cannot at all remember on what point, or on what kind of point—made us two juniors agree, that if Temple had only been an assistant master at an English Public School for a little while, Temple would be a perfect Headmaster. Nothing

all respects what we ought to be. One day one of us, soon after he had come, proved untrue to that trust. He began to talk to us about it; but after a few words he put his head into his hands and broke down utterly in tears. No one who was present will ever forget what he then felt."

¹ See also a sermon by Dr. Jex Blake, preached in Wells Cathedral on Christmas Day, 1902.

more mutinous than that ever crossed our minds; and, working under Temple for nearly eleven years, it never occurred to me through those years that he was rough.

When Temple had been Headmaster about a couple of years, a senior colleague at a Masters' Meeting remarked on the popularity of the school; and Temple said: "Ah, but some book by some one may check the popularity." I could not conceive what he meant; but very soon came out a volume entitled *Essays and Reviews*. The intense outburst of indignation among the religious world, near the close of the Christmas holidays, brought on a feverish attack which kept Temple to his bed for a day; but before the school met the Headmaster was himself entirely. A few weeks later a boy, who had just entered the Sixth Form, was exhorted from home not to be led astray from the true faith, and his reply was: "Dear Mother—Temple's all right; but if he turns Mahometan, all the school will turn too." That boy lived long enough to show great strength of character, with marked capacity for affairs; rose to be Financial Secretary to the Treasury, and President of the Board of Agriculture; and died, full of promise, April 28, 1903: R. W. Hanbury.

Early in his headmastership Mrs. Temple told me, with a glow of feeling, "No one taught Dr. Temple his Latin grammar; but I heard him say his lesson—I did not know Latin." Early also was the visit of the photographer from Leamington to take Mrs. Temple. "I cannot take that lady," was his hasty exclamation; "she will not stand still. Fetch her a chair." "No; fetch me Freddy," was the firm reply; and the Headmaster came at once to the spot, close to his study window and private door to the garden, gave Mrs. Temple his arm, and looked fondly down upon her as she stood, steady now as a Cornish rock. The photograph, taken in '58 or '59, is perfect in execution as well as in motive; and still is fresh and clear as at first.¹

Early in the sixties the Public School Commission was appointed, and four of the Commissioners paid a visit to Rugby, never to be forgotten. The Earl of Clarendon, Lord Lyttelton, Henry Halford Vaughan (Professor of Modern History at Oxford), and W. H. Thompson, then Fellow and afterwards Master of Trinity, spent three or four days at Rugby, in 1862 probably. They took great pains

¹ See Frontispiece.

to understand our complicated system, and looked upon our labours in a very friendly spirit, treating us with great considerateness and care. At dinner at the Schoolhouse I was placed next to W. H. Thompson, whose epigrams were many, and none of them unkindly. The Report of the Commissioners must have been of great help to the Headmaster in overcoming all kinds of opposition to necessary changes: *e.g.* in facilitating an increase in the numbers and value of the ten scholarships already established by the masters; in suggesting rearrangement of the distribution of the Revenue of the Foundation; in preparing the way for that Lower School of Lawrence Sheriffe which came into actual existence a dozen years later, in my own headmastership; and in beginning to provide additional school-rooms, especially for natural science, even before 1867, the Tercenary year.

The experience of the masters I have quoted was that of classical masters, who were teaching in a lower Form the same subjects that the Headmaster was teaching in the Sixth. Even to these, a large amount of liberty was allowed, each in his own class-room and with his own Form. But to those who were working at other branches, and perhaps developing new studies, an absolutely free hand was given. Excellent mathematician as he was, he allowed his colleagues to try their own experiments—and yet there is not one of them who does not owe much to councils-of-war in the Headmaster's study, on what was, in the sixties of the last century, as it is still in the early years of the new, the crux of the schoolmaster, the reform of geometrical teaching.

His effect on his masters may be most aptly described by what Canon Scott Holland has written of his effect on the London clergy: for the man at Rugby was the same man as at Fulham.

They (writes the Canon) discovered his full worth, and they became devoted to him. He worked like six horses; he let everybody else work; he believed in his men

—believed in them, indeed, to an extent which astonished and bewildered them.¹

The introduction of English into Form work, the extension of the natural science work, the inclusion of geology and botany, the birth of the Natural History Society, the formation of the Rifle Corps, the beginning of an Observatory,² all provided departments in which a master might have a free hand; and, though his chief knew, sometimes without the master's being aware of it, all he was doing, yet he never felt his own ideas cramped or thwarted. How much Dr. Temple knew, we hardly realised at the time. I remember a few years ago telling the Archbishop of something that occurred in my department at Rugby which I had not then reported to him. He attacked me vigorously for not having done so, and I defended the exercise of my discretion. But, after I had left the room, he burst into a laugh and said, "I knew it all the while."

This freedom of action extended even to his boarding-house. Mr. E. A. Scott,³ who became tutor of the Schoolhouse in 1862, writes to me :—

I remember once his saying to me: "You know I have always given you entire freedom to manage the House as tutor." This was wholly true. He never decided any point without giving entire opportunity to his tutor to say what he thought fit.

On one of these occasions, when a question was being discussed with one of the Schoolhouse tutors as to what steps were to be taken about a boy, concerning whom no doubt seemed possible,

¹ *The Commonwealth*, February 1903, p. 34.

² The beginning dates from Dr. Temple's time; but it was not till after Dr. Temple left that Mr. J. M. Wilson founded the Temple Observatory to his memory, and presented the well-known 8½ Alvan Clark Telescope, originally constructed for Dawes, the Astronomer.

³ Edward Ashley Scott; boy, 1842-48; master, 1859-96.

the discussion lasted long. The tutor pressed the overwhelming evidence; the while Temple walked backwards and forwards in the study for half an hour, moved almost to tears, saying: "But I am not sure that it is just." It was by his love of justice, doubtless, that he won the hearts of the boys; and it was this love of justice which led him to cherish, as the highest compliment ever paid to him, the boy's postscript to his letter to his father, unconsciously revealed to the Headmaster, "Of course Temple's a beast, but he's a just beast."

This freedom, granted to all who worked with him, was extended to his sister, Miss Temple. With her lay a large share of the management of the large boarding-house, and to her, as to others, he gave liberty of action.

Thus the indirect influence which Dr. Temple brought upon the school through his younger masters was as remarkable as the direct influence of his character on the boys themselves. Each, in carrying out independently his own work, yet felt in constant touch with his Head. In a course of letters written by a young master to his sister between 1861 and 1865, and re-read after forty years, the constant recurrence of the younger man to his chief—not only in school matters, but in matters of thought—is very striking. The weekly sermon is as recurring a matter of comment as it might be in a schoolboy's Sunday letter. Each new venture of work, and indeed in life, seems to be tested by his approval—"Temple thinks — is a success as far as it has gone"; "Temple thinks well of it." That is the standard of success.

In effecting the changes that he made in the school Dr. Temple always took his assistant masters into his confidence, and usually succeeded in carrying them with him. Masters' Meetings were held in the library about once a month; and,

though it was the fashion for the masters to grumble at the call upon their time, they were really greatly valued, and played an important part in these stirring times.

We repeatedly discuss the working of the school among ourselves (says Dr. Temple), make changes as they seem needed, and are ready to make more to the best of our ability.¹

Great freedom of discussion was allowed at these meetings. Every man's proposal, including those of the chairman, was freely and sometimes warmly criticised. Still, however much candid speaking was recognised, it was always understood that the decision lay with the Commander-in-Chief. On one notable occasion not one consentient voice had been raised in favour of a proposed change now long forgotten; but the meeting ended in a laconic "Well, we'll try it" — *Solvuntur risu tabulae*.

At Masters' Meetings (writes E. A. Scott) there could be no opposition to the schemes he brought forward, because Dr. Temple had always made allowance for every objection. Attempts might be made to oppose, but they always melted away, because the opponent found that he had been met at every point. Once he gave a humorous turn to his consciousness of this by saying that at Masters' Meetings he often felt that he had put good gold into the melting furnace, "but again and again, as in the case of Aaron, there came out this calf."

Many a repartee is handed down in tradition from these days. Thus, during the preparation of the first lengthy report of the Headmaster to the Trustees, after the Commissioners' report had been published, Dr. Temple submitted his draft to the assembled masters. A sitting ensued far beyond the expected time, and at last the weakness of

¹ Public Schools Commission Report, 1864, vol. ii. ; Answers, p. 311.

the flesh induced a feeble brother to suggest the adjournment for refreshment. "I've dined already," fell from the chair, and on we went with paragraph ten.

Nor was each master confined to his own department. At Masters' Meetings every man had an opportunity of expressing his opinion on any matter which affected the general interests of the school; and, if the meeting did not give sufficient opportunity, a master was not discouraged from setting forth, with the utmost frankness, his opinion in a fly-leaf. For example, in 1869 Mr. J. M. Wilson, in making a sweeping, though perhaps a salutary, attack on the general outcome of the public school education given at Rugby, set forth in such a brochure exactly how his masters stood to him. Few headmasters would allow their colleagues to write to them thus freely, and fewer would have it printed and circulated to the rest:—

The present letter is founded on some remarks which I made to you at the end of last term, and which you then gave me leave to address to you, more at length, in this shape. I understood also that you shared my views to some extent.

It is only in this way that an appeal can effectively be made by any of us to your own judgment, and the judgment of all our body; for a Masters' Meeting is not the place for any of us to bring forward what requires leisurely reflection, and I have no time to go round and discuss it in detail with my colleagues. I must, therefore, crave their pardon if they are disposed to condemn me for forwardness. We are, in fact, a "council of suggestions," and nothing else. Your despotism is beneficent, but it is unlimited; and I cannot but think it would be for the good of the school if we more frequently took the initiative as members of the school council, and considered ourselves less as mere operatives in particular departments.

When the Time-table was reconstructed to

admit of more liberal treatment of non-classical subjects, the Headmaster challenged the masters to send him complete working time-tables. He himself produced three for choice, and Mr. Wilson one. Naturally Mr. Wilson aimed at getting good hours for mathematics, and Dr. Temple wrote a humorous rejoinder in verse, from which, if it be only as a sample of the friendly terms on which he was with his masters, a few lines may be quoted :—

Mathematics will flourish, and $x y$ and z
Will dethrone Greek and Latin and rule here instead.
Ye Mathematicians, so this is your plot :
Catch a weazel asleep, but asleep I am not.

A Masters' Meeting followed, and a keen discussion—which again the Headmaster described in verse. It would be wrong to perpetuate a passing *jeu d'esprit* ; but two things appear from it—the keenness and the humour with which the battle of the subjects was fought, and the struggle that even under a liberal headmaster a non-classical subject had to make to get even—"three hours a week, just three hours a week."

Perhaps the most valuable lesson that the younger masters learnt from their chief was to imitate that quality which more than all endeared him to the school—his love of justice. It was not only that the Arnoldian tradition was insisted on that a boy's word should be taken,¹ but even when there was what to a young master seemed overwhelming proof of some wrong-doing,—say documentary evidence of school dishonesty,—he would stay his colleague's hand if the boy in question refused to admit the impeachment. It was better, he would say, that many a wrong deed should slip through unpunished than that a single act of injustice should be done. He insisted, too, on the

¹ Stanley's *Life of Arnold* (7th ed.), p. 89.

fullest allowance for the possible stupidity which might have led to the result; no boy was to be punished because he had misunderstood. Here, again, we find another likeness to his great predecessor. Dr. Arnold had said that before a boy of inferior natural ability, who honestly cultivated what powers he had, he would stand hat in hand; in like manner Dr. Temple ever impressed on us the duty of absolute justice to the less gifted of our Forms. The natural affinity which existed between the teacher and the cleverer boys of the Form would secure for them their full share of attention and sympathy. It was the duller brains that required the master's constant thought. "Even to understand their difficulties," writes Mr. Arthur Sidgwick,¹ in his admirable essay on Stimulus, "is a matter requiring the most acute and laborious and experienced mind"; and, when pressing the need of books written specially to suit their needs, the same writer adds: "In this most excellent movement I am proud to remember that the first great pioneer was Dr. Temple of Rugby."

Thus, and in many other ways, Dr. Temple reached the boys through the men who were working under him; in the free hand which he gave them even to make mistakes, he stands out in the list of great headmasters; and those who had the joy to work under him may be forgiven if they believe that no other headmaster exercised so close a personal influence over his colleagues, till insensibly the principles that guided him in his work began to guide them and make them act together as one man.

¹ *Three Lectures: The Practice of Education*, "On Stimulus," p. 44.

CHAPTER IV

REFORMS

Royal Commission on Public Schools and Public Schools Act
—Dr Temple's relations thereto—Consequential changes
at Rugby.

DR. TEMPLE had only been two years at Rugby when a Royal Commission was appointed, under the chairmanship of Lord Clarendon, "to inquire into the revenues and management of certain colleges and schools, and the studies pursued and instruction given therein." Of the nine schools to be inquired into, Rugby was one, and we thus have access both to the returns drawn up by the Headmaster in 1861 in answer to printed inquiries, and to the oral evidence which he gave before the Commissioners on their visit to Rugby in 1862. It is noticeable from the evidence that even before the appointment of the Commission, Dr. Temple had begun his reforms, and after its visit he was encouraged to proceed to further changes, so that when the Commissioners' report made its appearance, which was not till 1864, a great advance had already been made.

The report of the Commission was followed by the introduction into Parliament of the Public Schools Bill in the following year, and its reference by the House of Lords to a Select Committee, with Lord Clarendon again as chairman, and with

his present Majesty, then Prince of Wales, as one of the members. We have Dr. Temple's fresh evidence before this Committee, and are thus able to judge how much had been effected in the further interval.

It so happens, therefore, that Parliamentary papers appearing in successive years throw a flood of light on the changes Dr. Temple succeeded in introducing, and on those which he advocated, but did not stay long enough at Rugby to carry out. The Report of the Commission finally bore fruit in the Public Schools Act of 1868.

It may be well, however, before attempting to estimate the importance of the reforms effected by Dr. Temple, to go back in the history of the school and see how out of the very elements that had made the name of the school had arisen a state of affairs which in nearly every direction required readjustment.

Many beneficial changes had been, from time to time, introduced by his predecessors; the original genius of Arnold, the common sense of Tait, and the personal generosity of Goulburn had already done much. The urgent need was for a leader with organising power to codify the abnormalities that had not unnaturally come into existence, in some cases from the very originality of the lines which Arnold had laid down.¹

Perhaps the most striking of Arnold's reforms had been his mode of introducing modern subjects. Mathematics and modern languages were made by him a real part of the school course; and, lest the newer subjects should suffer in prestige and in discipline by being taught by a master of less standing, the form-master was expected to be able to teach any subject his Form required. Thus the

¹ Stanley's *Life of Dr. Arnold*, ch. iii. Letter to the Earl of Denbigh, p. 107 (7th ed.).

number of masters at the time of his death in 1842, when there were 375 boys in the school, was ten (including himself), and each took a Form and taught the three branches of classics, mathematics, and modern languages.¹ The new wine was to be put into old bottles; such an encyclopædic knowledge was unattainable, however, at any rate for a continuance.

The Public School Commissioners condemn Dr. Arnold's plan as a failure.

To exact (they say) from the accomplished classical masters of the year 1836, selected without reference to knowledge of French, the duty of giving grammatical instruction in a language for the correct teaching of which the "*Grammaire des Grammaires*" is not a superfluous instrument, was perhaps the requirement of a man ready to do wonders himself, and sanguine in his expectations from the zeal and versatility of others. The plan may be regarded as a failure.²

Dr. Tait tried to meet the case by appointing a master to teach modern languages in 1844, whose services were, so to speak, let out to any form-master who preferred paying a substitute to teaching the subject himself. In 1845 a similar mathematical specialist appears, no longer the non-graduate master of the pre-Arnoldian epoch, and in 1849 a teacher of science; and, by the end of his headmastership, there were, besides the twelve form-masters, four specialists; and, with some changes caused by the fall in numbers, this was continued till Dr. Temple came.

By 1857^{*} the demand for a wider curriculum had been taken up by the country, and the sudden rise in numbers of itself called for an increase in the staff. Dr. Temple set his face at once against

¹ Public Schools Commission; Answers to Printed Questions. Rugby, Answer 11, p. 301.

² Public Schools Commission; Report. Rugby, p. 249.

expecting several subjects from each man, although availing himself of any additional subjects which a graduate in Double Honours was competent to take. Before the Commission he bases his objection to requiring every form-master to teach at least one modern language on the limitation it would place on the range of choice.

I do not say (he says) that it would be impossible to get such a man. I think it would mischievously restrict the choice. You would find such men occasionally; but the result of making it a requirement would be that every now and then you would be obliged to take a man whom you thought second best, rather than the man you thought best.¹

In two years from his appointment Dr. Temple is able to report that he has nineteen masters, five of whom are specialists; while at the time of his leaving in 1869 there are twenty-two masters, of whom eight are teaching modern subjects.

The specialisation of the staff would naturally raise two difficulties: (1) the placing of the set-masters who taught non-classical subjects on an equal footing in the eyes of the boys with that of the form-masters; and (2) the supply of sufficient funds to enable Dr. Temple to pick his men as he liked.

The first difficulty had been already got over at Rugby. Mr. Robert Mayor for the mathematics, and Mr. P. Bowden Smith as a modern linguist, had attained a position for by-subjects which was not the case at the time at other great public schools. The questions put by the Commissioners to Dr. Temple indicate a surprise that such should be the case.

The other was a greater difficulty, and Dr. Temple had not waited for a Royal Commission to attack it. In 1859, in a Masters' Meeting, he

¹ Minutes of Evidence, p. 248; Answer, 217.

had taken the masters into his confidence, and by agreement with them had rearranged and limited the salaries of the form-masters so as to admit of the extension and broadening of the staff—a procedure which meets with the praise of the Commissioners. In a note to their general report they say that—

The distribution (of funds) at Rugby, which is stated to have been the result of a general discussion and agreement among the masters, may be referred to as an instance of a scheme evidently passed with careful regard to economy and equity, though we shall have occasion to suggest some changes in it.

Still the financial need was not fully met, and in the Headmaster's report to the Trustees in 1864¹ we find him preparing for the increase to be met with by raising the school fees to non-foundationers by one-third. Whatever was done, the salaries were not to be reduced below the line at which the best men could be obtained² :—

It would be a very great mistake he says (in his Answers) to lower the standard of the men appointed to assistant masterships in order to make the average size of a Form 29 instead of 33.

And again he replies to Lord Clarendon in 1862 that he finds it harder after the rearrangement to get men than formerly :—

I noticed that three years ago I had only to ask a man to come, and he came. This year I asked four men to come, and they declined, on the ground that the money was not enough; and this was in consequence of the reductions made in 1858.³

The inequality of salaries between the senior and junior masters was aggravated by the growth of

¹ Report to Trustees, 1863-64, p. 18.

² Public Schools Commission; Answers, p. 302; No. 11.

³ Public Schools Commission; Minutes, p. 251; No. 322.

the tutorial system. Every boy in the school, with the exception of a few of the foundationers in the Sixth, had a private tutor, and from the fees paid for this service the bulk of the classical masters' income was derived; while the salaries of the set-masters were also dependent on private pupils' payments. When Dr. Temple came, there was no limit to the number of pupils a tutor might take, and, except that as a rule a classical boarding-house master was tutor to his own boarders, there was nothing to prevent a popular master securing an undue share of pupils. One tutor-room might be overcrowded and another empty. Again Dr. Temple formulated a fair plan and induced the masters to accept it. A maximum number of pupils was agreed to, and in case, for private reasons, a master found it necessary to exceed his limit, the surplus fees went not to him but to a common fund. One can fancy the twinkle in the Headmaster's eye as he unfolded this self-acting and self-denying ordinance.

Another difficulty, closely allied to that of staff, fronted the Headmaster on his arrival—the want of sufficient class-rooms. At that time there were not enough rooms to give each Form a separate school, without using one or two rooms “decidedly too small for the purpose”;¹ and there were no rooms for specialists, no studio, no laboratory, no science lecture-room. As the school rose by leaps and bounds, this difficulty was accentuated.

To meet it some additions, including a laboratory, had been built by the time the Commission came; but even in 1861 Dr. Temple reports:—

We are much pinched for want of room. . . . The Headmaster's hayloft has been converted into a school-room, and we rent another in the Town Hall. We ought to have not

fewer than three new school-rooms even to meet the wants of our present staff.¹

Nevertheless, the Commissioners were not convinced, and failed to make the recommendation which Dr. Temple had hoped ; so before the House of Lords Committee we find him again returning to the attack : " I am quite sure we want more buildings at Rugby, and that we want them very much indeed." A clause in the Public Schools Bill was likely to prevent the Trustees from free action in the matter, and naturally Temple objected, because it was from the Trustees that he expected and ultimately did receive relief. " You find,"² asks Lord Derby, " that constant dropping wears out the Trustees?" " Yes," was the laconic reply. In 1864 a block of buildings (the site of Sally Hallowell's old house at the corner) had been taken, and without waiting to pull the house down, we took possession of the various rooms just as they were ; even the kitchen being made use of as a botanical school. It was on the site of this block that the new quadrangle was built as the masters' contribution to the Tercentenary Fund in 1867, first brought into use in May 1870, in Dr. Hayman's first year of mastership. In this quadrangle for the first time fair accommodation was provided for drawing and science,—not perhaps what would now be required in a higher grade school, but at any rate *some* of the specialists ceased henceforth to be " wandering Jews."

The need for and serviceableness of all that was built in Dr. Temple's time has never been questioned. Opinions differ as to the style of architecture. Many were the remonstrances of old Rugbeians that the choice of an architect, even for

¹ P.S.C. Answers, p. 511.

² Select Committee on Public Schools Bill [H. L.], 1865 ; p. 165, 1113-1116.

a cricket pavilion or a fives-court, was restricted to one individual.

In this, as in many other cases, Dr. Temple showed an unswerving faithfulness to a man whom he had once carefully chosen, and who he honestly believed had been rightly selected.

In advocating and introducing reforms, Dr. Temple was no servile follower of the Commissioners' recommendations; on two important points he differed from them, and expressed himself forcibly. Evidence had been given as to the relations between the Trustees and successive headmasters; and Dr. Temple in his evidence, when asked by Lord Devon whether practically during the time he had been Headmaster, he had found the discretion which he had in the management of the school in any way interfered with, had replied: "Not in the slightest degree."¹ Further, the Commissioners in their report² had borne witness to "that breadth of view in matters of education, and that liberality of temper in personal relations with able headmasters of the school, which have characterised the dealings of this body."

In some of the new recommendations, Dr. Temple saw the possibility of future interference, and in his first report to the Trustees he pleads forcibly the cause of all his successors. In the present day, when headmasters are threatened with possible interference from the Board of Education and the County Councils, as well as from their own Governing Bodies, Dr. Temple's plea deserves so well the study of educationalists that it shall be given in full³ :—

The Commissioners recommend that among the twelve Trustees, four should be elected for eminence in literature or

¹ P.S.C. Question 145, p. 246.

² P.S.C. Report, p. 297.

³ P.S.C. Reports; Rugby, Recommendations 1, 2, 3, 4, 5; pp. 298, 299.

science; that the body of Trustees thus constituted should take a much more active part than heretofore in the management of the school; that the powers of the Headmaster should be increased in some respects and limited in others, but in every way more precisely defined. I think the Commissioners are right in advising that the Trustees should in future be more fully informed of all that is done in the school; and I propose to make these annual reports the means of giving them this information. I propose in these reports to give not only full statistics of the working and the condition of the school, but also a balance-sheet showing precisely the appropriation of all money received as school fees or tuition fees. When this is done the Trustees will always have it in their power to interfere whenever they may think it necessary to do so; and, short of interference, they will always be able to point out to the Headmaster any arrangement which appears to them either inexpedient at the time or likely to become so afterwards, and to ask for an explanation. The fullest effective control will thus be always within their reach. But I cannot advise the Trustees to go beyond this point. The present system has all experience in its favour; and, I think, not only experience, but reason. The Headmaster of a school like this ought to be a man better capable of working it well, and better able to initiate improvements than any one else that can be found for the post. If a mistake has been made (in the selection of the Headmaster), and the Headmaster is not capable of this, the worst that can happen is that the school will languish a little, and that improvements will be delayed, until the time comes for electing another Headmaster. But this is a very minor evil in comparison with hampering all Headmasters by subjecting them to constant interference. For this reason I cannot concur in the recommendation to elect four trustees eminent for literature and science. This recommendation seems to me to rest on an entirely mistaken supposition in regard to the true nature of the services which the Trustees can render to the school. What the school needs in the Trustees is good sense and knowledge of the world. The four gentlemen elected for their eminence in literature or science would be perpetually tempted to justify their election by doing what the Headmaster ought to do, and, if he is fit for his post, can do better than any one else. They would often be tempted to push the interests of their own particular study

to the detriment of general education. They would be almost certain to encourage an amount of interference, which, if it hastened or even introduced improvements at the time, would purchase them at the dear price of diminishing the Headmaster's sense of responsibility and freedom of action. I am confident that in the end the school would lose much more than it gained.

The second point which illustrates Dr. Temple's independence of thought, and, at the same time, his far-sightedness, is his proposal with regard to the foundationers. The subject was no new one to him. He was able to say in 1865 that it was quite eighteen years ago since he first went to work at the question, made an analysis of all the reports of the grammar schools, and then began to read a great many of the Founders' wills.

Free education had been given in Rugby School to the children of parents resident within a certain distance of Rugby. The Commissioners in 1864 proposed the abolition of the foundation, and the establishment of open scholarships out of the funds so set free. On the other hand, the inhabitants of Rugby naturally clung to the privileges which had come down to them from the days of Queen Bess and her grocer, Lawrence Sheriffe.

Dr. Temple was bold enough to propose a middle course, which brought on him the criticism of the reforming Commissioners, and did not save him from the attack of the townsmen. He suggested that a local school should be erected in Rugby, under the control of the Headmaster, but otherwise worked independently of the larger school; in this a semi-classical and commercial education was to be given free to the children of the privileged residents, and from it yearly the cleverer boys were to pass on to Rugby School by means of close scholarships. Such a school was made permissible by the Act

of 1868, was completed and opened in Dr. Jex Blake's headmastership, and has, under its able master,¹ fully met the honest needs of the locality.

Dr. Temple's arguments before the Commissioners in 1862, and before the Committee of the Lords in 1865, clearly define the different aims of a local and a non-local school, and are worthy the study of those who are engaged in the co-ordination of secondary education.

It was alleged before the Committee of the House of Lords² that the result of abolishing the foundations and establishing open scholarships would be to transfer the benefits not only from the local area to England generally, but from the poor to the rich.

It was pointed out that the expense of preparing boys for the open competitions would be so great that only the well-to-do parent could afford it. To this Dr. Temple replied that in a little while, when all the foundations had been thrown open, so large a field would be opened to clever boys that the sons of the poor would get in as well as those of the more prosperous.

I think (said Dr. Temple in 1865) that there was a great deal of truth in that (the argument of Mr. Ramsay) twenty years ago. There is very much less truth in it now; and I believe, as the foundations are opened, there will be less and less truth in it as time goes on, and in a very little while I think there will be no truth in it at all.

It is interesting to inquire how far Dr. Temple's prophecy has come true; and, in the opinion of the present Headmaster, after forty years of trial, the foundation of the open scholarships is justified. There is, no doubt, a certain percentage of the scholarships given by open competition which go

¹ H. E. Weisse, now Headmaster of the Liverpool Institute.

² See Evidence of Mr. J. H. Ramsay, Committee on Public Schools Bill [H.L.], 1865, p. 70.

to the sons of parents who do not want the money. Some of these, however, refund the money¹ in whole or in part, so as to form a fund from which the scholarships of the most needy may be supplemented. The majority go to the sons of parents to whom, in differing degrees, the pecuniary help is of importance; such boys, in the present Headmaster's opinion, could not have come to Rugby or gone to any other public school without help. Further, in the cases of the very poor boys, the augmented scholarship has, in several instances, enabled boys, who afterwards proved themselves to have powers of the very highest order, to come to Rugby at practically no expense to the parent.²

¹ Dr. Temple thus writes to his son William, May 7, 1900:—"Do you think you are likely to get an Exhibition? I should like your name to appear among the List of Exhibitioners. But I should like you in that case . . . in some such way to give the money back to the school."—ED.

² I am indebted to Dr. James for information on this point, which I could not otherwise have obtained.

CHAPTER V

ORGANISATION

Enlargement of curriculum—Memorandum of Mr. Otto Goldschmidt—Rearrangement of Forms—Article by Mr. Arthur Sidgwick.

It might have been sufficient to let Dr. Temple's reputation as a practical and far-seeing schoolmaster rest on his larger and better-known reforms. It is clear, however, that there is a risk lest the minor changes, due to his initiative, should be forgotten. Recent books on Rugby seem rather to distinguish the Temple period by the accident that the Tercentenary of the founder fell in 1867, and that the Public School Act became law in 1868, than by any period of continuous internal reform.

This must be the excuse for entering into further details, interesting mainly to pedagogues, so as to show that there was scarcely any branch of the work or of the life on which he did not make his permanent mark.

Probably the most productive of these changes was the widening of the course of study; in the decade under consideration, a variety of modern subjects ceased to be the special choice of a few boys, and were accepted as part of the essentials of a liberal education.

Natural science had never been entirely neglected at Rugby; even in the days of Wooll the

occasional lectures given by eminent men of science who visited the school were spoken of with gratitude by men of that generation, such as Andrew Bloxam and M. J. Berkeley, the botanists, and Hensleigh Wedgwood, the philologist; and the subject was always accessible to those that cared for it in the succeeding periods. But Dr. Temple, in the very first year of his time, gave reality to the study by the introduction of practical work in the new laboratory, and, in 1864, he took the important step of making natural science a compulsory subject for all boys below the Upper School.

It is true, as has been pointed out elsewhere, that in his scheme of education Dr. Temple gave the first place to the literary side, as dealing with men and not with things; yet he recognised the claims of science, and gave full encouragement to it.

A boy ought not to be ignorant of this earth on which God has placed him, and ought, therefore, to be well acquainted with geography. He ought not to walk in the fields in total ignorance of what is growing under his very eyes, and he ought, therefore, to learn botany. There is hardly an occupation in which he can be employed where he will not find chemistry of use to him.¹

Hence it was that he caused chemistry, geology, and botany to be, with some branches of physics, the chief scientific subjects in 1864, and advised that botany should be made the subject first taken throughout the Middle School, because it could be taught, to a certain extent, practically, without waiting for the special accommodation which other subjects required, and which was not then available. The choice, indeed, of botany as a school subject was favoured by his having himself no mean knowledge of our native plants; and he took a special and personal interest in the success of the experiment,

¹ P.S.C. Answers, p. 311.

visiting the classes, sometimes at very awkward moments, to see how things were going on. The ideas with which this attempt was made in the sixties have been admirably set out in Mr. J. M. Wilson's essay on the Teaching of Natural Science in Schools, forming one of the *Essays on a Liberal Education*, edited in 1867 by the Rev. F. W. Farrar, then a master at Harrow.

Then, in 1865, came the introduction of English language and literature as a form-subject throughout the school. Here the Headmaster began the change by submitting for discussion in Masters' Meeting a most suggestive paper on what the teaching of English did and did not mean, and what standard could be reasonably aimed at in different parts of the school. In any school up to this time the reading of any English author in school had been a rare exception ; now there is scarcely a Form in any secondary school where some English book is not read. Yet the teachers of to-day might learn much from the paper.

The object (he says) is clear intelligence first, and appreciation next. The former may be secured by method, the latter is the more difficult to teach. It is no use to practise unintelligent, sing-song, careless reading. Pains must be taken to have clear enunciation, proper pauses, proper emphasis, proper cadence. . . . It should be a pleasure to hear, or it is of little value.

So, again, the period of English literature is to synchronise with the cycle of English history. And here we come on a bit of personal evidence worth recording :—

When I examined for the Indian Civil Service I found a good deal of stupidity and a good deal of gross ignorance among the 130 candidates, and this was visible in many who had had a classical training. But in spite of this I picked out, unfailingly, those who had had that training, by the greater appreciation of style which they invariably showed, when

compared with the others. Matthew Arnold examined for the same purpose a year or two ago, and he made the same remark.

As regards music and drawing the Commissioners had recommended as follows :—

We are of opinion that every boy should learn either music or drawing during a part, at least, of his stay at school.¹

At that time each of these subjects was voluntary at Rugby, and taken up by about a tenth of the school. Dr. Temple was willing to carry out the proposed reform, and make one or other of the subjects compulsory up to a certain Form in the school. In this he could not carry the Trustees entirely with him, but, short of it, he inaugurated a revolution in the teaching. He doubled the teaching power in both arts, and included the provision of special accommodation in the new buildings he was already contemplating.

In drawing, a resident master of the highest qualifications, Mr. Tupper, was added to the staff, and, by his presence, tended to raise drawing to a level with other subjects.

Music was placed under the general direction of Mr. Otto Goldschmidt, at that time a professor of the Royal Academy of Music, and subsequently vice-principal under Sterndale Bennett. An able memorandum on what might be done for music in a public school was submitted by Mr. Goldschmidt to the Headmaster, and, as far as lay in Dr. Temple's power, was carried out to the end of his reign. The new director was no stranger to Rugby; on a previous occasion he had stayed there with Madame Goldschmidt, the Jenny Lind of musical history. Of that visit many an old Rugbeian remembers how, on a Sunday morning, a hurried notice went round to the houses that.

¹ P.S.C. General Report, First Part, Section viii. p. 33.

Madame Goldschmidt would sing from the "Messiah" to the boys in the afternoon in the big school. Dinner over, boys and masters hurried in, and, with characteristic kindness, Madame Goldschmidt lavished on the boys the voice that England was longing to hear.

The following account has been received from Mr. Goldschmidt :—

LONDON, *October 1903.*

DEAR MR. KITCHENER—You have referred to the recommendations of the Public School Commission in the year 1864, in consequence of which I had the honour of being invited by Dr. Temple (most probably at the suggestion of the Reverend Charles Arnold) to come to Rugby, in order to confer with him on the subject.

This I did in the early spring of 1864, and soon after submitted to him a detailed memorandum.

Dr. Temple had led me to think that the tuition and cultivation of music, as sketched out in my memorandum, would, in a measure, be made obligatory. When the Trustees, however, refused to sanction this, I believed my mission to have come to an end, but on the Headmaster's appeal, and with the promise of his support, I agreed to go on with the work. This support, indeed, was nobly given throughout the five and a half years that I held the post of Musical Examiner—years during which I enjoyed the hospitality of Dr. and Miss Temple at the Schoolhouse whenever I visited Rugby.

The chief suggestions in my memorandum, as adopted and introduced by Dr. Temple, consisted in the encouragement of the boys (a) to join the chapel choir ; (b) to learn to read music ; (c) to take up the study of an instrument ; and lastly, to sing concerted music in classes. Dr. Temple granted prizes for class-singing, for paper-work in general musical knowledge and harmony exercises, as an extra inducement, and, though I had no means of knowing for certain, I could not help thinking that their cost was defrayed by himself.

The scheme came into operation at the beginning of the Michaelmas term, 1864, and I went to Rugby at Christmas for the first examination, when I was more than astonished at the excellent rendering, by the well-balanced

school choir, of the musical part of the service, intonation and enunciation being equally good.

My second experience is also worth noting. The first school concert of the time was postponed till June 1865. Among the pieces then chosen for the choir was Handel's well-known anthem, "Zadok the Priest," ending with "Long live the King," and my expectation that words and music would appeal to the young fellows proved correct, their rendering being so spirited as to gain an irresistible encore.

I have retained the impression of both these instances all these years.

Much of the credit of such good results was due to the teaching and encouragement of Mr. Edwin Edwards, the music-, choir-master, and, subsequently, organist of the school. Mr. Edwards was appointed in October 1864, and will, I feel sure, be remembered by Rugbeians of that day as a most kindly and encouraging teacher.

For the second post, that of instrumental teacher, Dr. Temple allowed me to nominate Mr. Anders Petterson, a Swede by birth, who had held the "Jenny Lind" travelling scholarship from Stockholm for three years, and whose special fitness for the post was that, besides being an excellent violinist, he was also an expert on various wind instruments.

From the outset I was guided in my estimate of what might be done at an English public school with a study, if properly regulated and encouraged, by my belief in the power of the boys' receptiveness, and the sense of honour and fair play to which one might appeal.

And of this belief I had an early proof. For, on the occasion of my first class examination, on arriving—in a snowstorm—at the station, I was warned that the examiner would meet with a queer reception at the first house where he was due. And, sure enough, the young fellows all sat on the tables, looking very surly, and they did very badly.

At the end I told them so, and asked whether they could not realise that I had not come down—in a snowstorm—for my own pleasure, but as a matter of duty to the post I held. I added that they all knew what duty was, and I expected them at the next examination to come out top of the classes. This that house actually did, and so a battle in the interests of music was won.

Dr. Temple approved of what I had said, and supported me again by, for the future, summoning the classes to the

big room in the Schoolhouse, instead of the examiner having to perambulate from house to house.

So, for five years, music prospered in chapel and out of it. Examinations were held in classes and paper-work every half-year. On one occasion, in my enforced absence, the written examination was taken by Sir John Goss of St. Paul's; and ten school concerts took place during the time, at none of which the Headmaster and Miss Temple failed to be present.

At these concerts the substantial works sung (among others) were: selections from Haydn's "Seasons," and from the "Messiah" and "Samson," Mozart's Litany in Bb, Mendelssohn's "42nd Psalm," the Dettingen "Te Deum," and "Zadok the Priest," already mentioned.

I leave to other pens, better able and entitled, to laud the great Headmaster's character and influence; but with regard to the particular sphere to which he had called me I may be permitted to say that, whatever his personal liking for music may have been, Dr. Temple, once having adopted it at the school as an adjunctive study, helped it on in every way, and gave it, and those who were responsible for its cultivation, a most generous support, all the more remarkable in the sixties in a public school of Rugby's standing.

As illustrative of the after-results to some of the boys of those days, I should like to quote the following incident:—

Some ten years ago, at Pontresina, an English clergyman came up, addressing me by name. I could not recognise in him the boy in jackets I had known twenty years before. "What!" he said, "don't you remember M——, the Lark?" Then I did remember him as having sung the treble solos in Haydn's "Seasons" at a concert. Whereupon followed a warm recognition, which ended with his saying, "Of all the things I learnt at Rugby, the music has helped me most in the work of my parish!"

I owe you many thanks, dear Mr. Kitchener, for having given me the opportunity of offering my humble tribute to Dr. Temple on his furtherance, on a systematic and dignified basis, of the cause of music among the young, due in no little sense to the earnestness of purpose which was one of the great characteristics of the late Primate on all matters which he considered worthy of attention.—Yours very truly,

OTTO GOLDSCHMIDT.¹

¹ For further details see an article on "Otto Goldschmidt" in the *Musical Age*, March 1903, pp. 46, 47.

The increasing pressure of candidates for entrance enabled Dr. Temple, without checking the rise in numbers, to introduce two salutary reforms. Already, in 1862, he had been able to say to the Commissioners¹ :—

I refuse twice as many (non-foundations) as I take, because I have not room. I have three times as many applications as I can take into the school.

It had always been desirable to clear the school of unsuitable boys, and now it was possible to do so without depopulating the houses.

That same year he introduced the superannuation of such boys as had failed to reach a Form in the school suitable to their age, and in a few years,² in accordance with the recommendation of the Commission, new boys were required to pass an entrance examination, so that the applicants might be sifted before admission. The entrance was not indeed thrown open to free competition, but for any vacancies a larger number of applicants were summoned up for examination than could be received. It was from the first no mere farce, for we find Dr. Temple telling the Committee of the House of Lords in the first year³ :—

The Public School Commissioners recommended an entrance examination. We adopted the recommendation: it has not been at work very long, but it has already produced a very clear and perceptible difference in the degree to which boys are prepared before they come to us. We have rejected about one-seventh.

Two further improvements, now adopted in most well-organised schools of a large size, owe their introduction to this period.

The first was the use of "parallel" Forms, origin-

¹ P.S.C. Evidence; Rugby; Answer 392.

² Headmaster's Report to Trustees, 1864-65.

³ P. 144. Answers 864, 888.

ally started by Dr. Tait, but soon abandoned. This term is not used at Rugby, as sometimes elsewhere, to cover all Forms with a synchronous time-table, but to mean Forms of equal rank and standard, taught by different men, and through only one of which a boy need pass to reach the Form above. Dr. Temple described them at some length to the puzzled Commissioners,¹ and explained how the journey up the school was thereby shortened. He thus summed up the evils which the new plan avoided :—

When each boy had to pass through every Form, the clever boys went up too fast and the dull ones too slowly. The clever ones never stayed long enough in a Form for the master's hold of them; and the slower boys got disheartened by the sight of the terrific ladder which they had to climb; they had a sort of feeling that they would never get to the top.

The other was the introduction of the "cycle" in ancient, modern, and scripture history. This was so arranged that approximately the same periods should be dealt with at the same time by the whole school. This secured a boy's having a consecutive vista of history, instead of a set of kaleidoscopic fragments.

Less instructive to the student of educational history, but perhaps more so to the young men who were learning under him to be headmasters themselves, was the extreme care he took that, as far as he could prevent it, offences should not come through the mere accidents of tradition. The abolition of "standing in goal" is treated in the next chapter; but the stroke of genius which turned calling-over from a recurring source of disorder into a mere form should not be forgotten. It had been the custom to pen the five hundred boys twice on a half-holiday into the big school,

¹ P.S.C. p. 259. Questions 590-608.

and let them out in single file at one end as each answered to his name. Meanwhile, during the quarter of an hour that elapsed, praepostors, with more or less success, kept order by patrolling the room, armed with their official implements of repression. Dr. Temple opened the door at the other end, the tumult was transferred from the school to the quadrangle, the thin file poured in at one door and out at another; and a difficulty which had tried the temper of generations of masters simply died out.

It is impossible to sum up the changes of this period more clearly than has been done by Mr. Arthur Sidgwick¹ in an article on Rugby in the *New Quarterly*.²

When it (the Commission) took the schools actually in hand, Rugby was found, owing to the energy and foresight of its Headmaster, to be far less in arrear than most of the others in respect of the necessary or desirable reforms. He had already improved the mathematics. He had increased the staff. He had built new schools. He had enlarged and systematised the teaching of history. He had still further organised the already sound system of competition. He had introduced parallel Forms, to avoid the evil of too many steps in the ladder of a large school. Above all, he had made a real beginning of natural science. . . .

It cannot be wondered at that at the close of the Report on Rugby, they (the Commissioners) take occasion to advert to a "few leading features, not, indeed, peculiar to this school, but all specially observable here, which," they say, "go far to explain that public confidence which the school has for many years possessed, and never, since the days of Arnold, in larger measure than at the present moment"; and that the first of these features is "a Headmaster whose character for ability, zeal, and practical success promise to make him conspicuous on the list of Rugby Headmasters." This "promise" he amply fulfilled.

He introduced a regular system of superannuation, which

¹ Boy, 1853-59; master, 1864-79.

² *New Quarterly Magazine*, October 1879, p. 264.

rid the school of one of its worst plagues, the idle "heavies" at the bottom. He started an entrance examination. English teaching was made universal below the Sixth. The science teaching was extended. Drawing or music was made compulsory on all boys for a time. The two half-years were commuted for three terms.

The masters subscribed enough money to build a new quadrangle containing a music school, a drawing school, two science lecture-rooms, an electricity and chemistry room, and six good classical schools. The chapel was also enlarged to meet the increased numbers. A gymnasium was contemplated. These buildings were not finished when Dr. Temple was made Bishop of Exeter.

CHAPTER VI

SCHOOL GAMES

Football—Hare and hounds—Rifle corps—Athletics and character.

THE discussion of Dr. Temple's action as a Headmaster would not be complete without some reference to that branch of school-life which is, to a great degree, left, and rightly left, to be organised and ruled by the boys themselves, but which, under a strong Headmaster, takes the place he chooses to give it.

Dr. Temple started with a natural fellow-feeling for the athletic side of school-life. His first words to the head of the Schoolhouse, who happened also to be head of the School Eleven, were: "Well, Sandford, how's the cricket?" He was still, and indeed he remained always, a boy in his enjoyment of the buoyancy and freshness of young life. But the games were more to him than a mere joyous recreation; they were a potent factor in his hands for the moulding of human character. All the more because the value of the games was high, did he watch them with constant care. Every half-holiday did the Headmaster take his quick walk round the Close, with keen interest in what was going on, breaking out now and again into words of advice and encouragement. And this watchfulness bore fruit, in reforms in the 'boys' own

dominion, where they, with the conservatism natural to schools, clung to old tradition.

It was indeed the keen sympathy which he was known to feel with all games of which he approved that gained for him a ready ear when he attacked any old abuse. Two instances may be given. One custom had become so deep-rooted that not only the success of Rugby football, but the maintenance of the praepostorial system had come to be associated with it. From the account of the football-match in *Tom Brown's School Days*, it will be seen that those who were not allowed actually to take part in the game were obliged to stand behind the goal-line, on a chance that a turn in the game, only happening at rare intervals, might call them into play. Wet or dry they were compelled by the Sixth to stand, and any attempt to escape was treated as one of the deadly sins. It was a gratuitous temptation, set before the unruly, "the more mischievous of the crowd snatching a fearful joy from attempts to attach lighted crackers to the coat-tails of unpopular praepostors."¹ The Sixth had so long regarded the maintenance of "goal" as the palladium of their rights, that they could not see that the original spirit had gone out of it, and nothing but the inherent evils remained. A few of Dr. Temple's rapid walks round the Close were sufficient to show him the danger to health and to discipline of this enforced observance. In his very first year the custom of "keeping goal" was abolished, except on three show-days in the year, retained out of respect to the feelings of past generations. I well remember the rumour of the dreadful change reaching the old Rugbeian colony at Cambridge, and the shaking of heads, and the foreboding expressed that all that Arnold had won, Temple had lost in a day. But at Rugby the boys

¹ *Football: The Rugby Union Game*, by Rev. F. Marshall, 1892, p. 16.

knew their master, and accepted his decision with hardly a murmur.

The other instance came, a few years later, when a very characteristic speech from Dr. Temple, after morning prayers, altered the whole character of the Rugby game of football. Hitherto the numbers playing on each side in a "Big Side" match had been practically unlimited; any present boy of a certain standing in the game had a right to play for his side, while any old Rugbeian, who happened to be present, might rejoin the side to which he had last belonged. Hence had arisen a legalised abuse; the ball could not be driven through the thick crowd of forty or fifty players without the free use of the so-called "hacking" to make a way for it. How loath Dr. Temple was to interfere is shown by the following story. An old Rugbeian writes¹ :—

My father was one day watching a game by the Doctor's side, and, commenting on a scrimmage in which the boys seemed inextricably mixed up, and limbs seemed to have but an off-chance of emerging whole, my father said, "Do you ever stop this sort of thing?" "Never, short of manslaughter," was Dr. Temple's characteristic answer.

So long as this rough play, however barbaric, was carried out fairly, and in good temper, there had been no great harm done; but in some matches, and especially in those between rival boarding-houses, ill-feeling had arisen, and the annual match between two particular sides had become a scandalous occasion for paying off old scores. The Headmaster had already shown what was in his mind.

The present Bishop of London (the historian of the game, Mr. A. G. Guillemard, writes) set his face sternly against vicious hacking; and on one occasion, noticing a much-

¹ L. R. Whigham; boy, 1862-66.

dreaded "Hack" hewing his way through a Big Side scrimmage with unnecessary violence, threatened to make him take off his navvies, and play in slippers for the rest of the afternoon.¹

The question to be settled was whether intentional hacking should cease to be a legalised part of the game. The school was itself half-shaken in its allegiance to tradition when this characteristic speech, coming from Dr. Temple, clinched the matter: "Englishmen," he told them, "had a national right to grumble, and so had English boys. He gave them leave to grumble at all he was going to do." Then the merits of the case were shortly stated, and intentional hacking declared illegal. Another Rugby tradition was gone, and yet, miracle of miracles, a loud cheer burst from the five hundred boys. The history of the game shows how, from that day, the sport was changed. Older Rugbeians² still thought, and of course always will think, that, as regards the dangers of the game, the old accidents only went out to give place to others of another kind; but there can be no doubt that the moral evil of spiteful play, and that was more to Temple than any risk to legs or limbs, passed away in that school-boys' cheer.

Instances might be multiplied of the hold which he thus gained upon the boys, and carried them with him even against their will. Mr. H. Lee Warner gives two illustrations of how, when he had made up his mind to act, he would expound his views at infinite pains, and end with one short sentence which left no doubt as to the rule he meant to promulgate:—

¹ *Football: The Rugby Union Game*, by Rev. F. Marshall, 1892, p. 77.

² My recollections are that the spitefulness was confined to individual players; and that it was not a general characteristic of the game. This is also, I understand, the view of the writer.—En.

There was constant irritation between the farmers in the neighbourhood of Rugby and the boys who went hare and hounds, and at last he had to make some very strict legislation on the subject. His custom was on these occasions to speak to the boys after prayers. On the morning in question he began his address—"You are always complaining that you do not like the Leicester mutton that Warwickshire farmers keep. I grant you Leicester mutton will never be so nice as Southdown. But Southdowns can get over the fences, unless they are kept close, easier than the others. Therefore, if you want the Rugby butcher to give you Southdown mutton, you must respect the farmers' fences," and so on. On another occasion, when he had to promulgate a still more unpopular resolve against permitting fireworks, he began in a semi-confidential, semi-rollicking style—"I never could see why you should remember, remember the fifth of November"; and, after arguing the point historically, and finally ending up his speech with the words—"and you are not to do it," surprised the boys into giving him a cheer, which made an American visitor present say, "That man is the biggest demagogue I have heard in England."

It is interesting to contrast the opinions of the boys, as shown by their school magazine, at the beginning and the end of his headmastership; in the early years every change is looked on with suspicion—"The spirit of Radicalism was coming in like a flood and carrying all before it." "Take away," the *New Rugby Magazine* concludes in despair, "all that makes English Rugby, and metamorphose it into a French Eton."¹ But when Dr. Temple left Rugby, its successor, the *Meteor*, expressed its appreciation of the value of what reforms Dr. Temple had made :—

The enrolment of the rifle corps, and the abolition of goal, are instances of his judicious interference with the games, the propriety of which has been attested by each successive generation of Rugbeians. . . . No old Rugbeian will fail to bear witness to the strong conservative element in Dr. Temple's character, his intense respect for old associations

¹ The *New Rugby Magazine*, vol. i. p. 202.

and radical objection to change. . . . What single old custom in the school or his house has been touched by sacrilegious hands during his reign? If he is the first to touch anything that is utterly bad, he is the last to cut down the tree which may still bear fruit.¹

The keen interest which the Headmaster took in the games was never allowed to let them overpower the more important interests. To him they were part of the training of character; and the slackness that led a boy to drop a catch at a critical point of a match, or to shirk the game on the last day of a big football match, was as much to be expelled as that which led to false concords or incorrect reasoning. Under a less strong ruler the encouragement that he gave might have led the leaders of the sports to assume a false position to the danger of school morale; but no one ever doubted which the Headmaster put first. If any one did, the Headmaster had his own way of dispelling the mistake. A traditional story may illustrate this. A boy athlete, not high up in the school, was reported to Temple for neglected work; he was sent for by the chief to his study, the time fixed apparently accidentally being just as an interesting match was about to begin. The boy went, but he found Dr. Temple immersed in correspondence; he stood watching the Headmaster's pen and gazing furtively at the match out of the window. A silent hour passed, and "no side" was called in the Close. "Now you may go," said the Headmaster without looking up. There was no need to enforce the moral further. It was equally impossible for Temple to recognise that a boy could not care for school games because he was working with his head, as for him to allow an athlete to plead his prowess as any mitigation of his slackness. Hence he could say, and say truly:—

¹ The *Meteor*, October 28, 1869.

It is certainly the general custom for boys most distinguished for their progress in intellectual studies to take interest in all the games. No difference between different intellectual studies in this respect is observable.¹

But the natural head of all school organisation, to make rules for games and for the management of the school Close, was not to be an athletic club, but the Sixth Form.

The boys (he says) have a kind of constitution of their own,² by which they make rules for games and for the management of the school Close, and, subject to the approval of the Headmaster, levy taxes for these objects. The natural head of this organisation is the Sixth Form, and the whole school is led by that form and reacts upon it. For this reason the Sixth Form is never felt to be an alien body by the rest.³

The demand of any athletic club to entrench on the office of the Sixth would have met from Dr. Temple the most peremptory rejection.

From the first, as we have already seen, the boys recognised in Dr. Temple a man who did not accept the existence of the games as an influence of doubtful character which had to be dealt with, but who had the keenest personal sympathy with the Close and its developments. They did not so soon learn how he regarded it as one of the strongest forces to mould the character, and the most valuable corrective against the self-indulgence and laziness of the bigger and more animal-like

¹ Public School Commission, Answers, p. 310 ; No. 42.

² The constitution to which Dr. Temple refers is probably the Big Side Levée (consisting of the Sixth and one or two of the other Head forms). The management of cricket and of the Close in the cricket season was more immediately under the Head of the Eleven. In confirmation of what is said above as to Dr. Temple's desire to give mental capacity its proper place in controlling athletics, it may be mentioned that when first he came to Rugby, he spoke to the Head of the Eleven as to how far in future the position of Captain should be made to depend upon place in the school.—En.

³ Public School Commission, Answers, p. 310, No. 28. See also Evidence, p. 269, No. 969.

boys on the one hand, and the morbidly conscientious and over-stimulated minds of the more spiritual and older boys on the other. How greatly he considered the Close as working with the chapel in the development of character is shown by a story which Mr. A. Butler recalls. Mr. Butler had been talking over with him the effect on the boys of spending Easter at school, and had said that they would not easily forget his Holy-Week sermons. "I should not venture," he answered, "to preach those sermons if it were not for the playground." There the Sixth Form praepostor threw off the strain of his awakening responsibilities and became the boy again; there the over-grown loafer of the Middle School learnt that he had a giant's strength, and God had given it him to use and not abuse.

CHAPTER VII

PREACHING AND THE CHAPEL.

General character of the sermons—Good Friday and Easter Day sermons—Addresses before Communion—Annual Confirmations—*Essays and Reviews* in relation to the school—Recollections of Dr. Percival.

THE offices of Headmaster and Chaplain were held by different persons till the year 1831; it was then that Arnold made the stand, which has now become historical, in his letter to Lord Denbigh, the then Chairman of the Trustees, in which he urged the claim of the Headmaster to the appointment of Chaplain :—

Whoever is Chaplain, I must ever feel myself, as Headmaster, the real and proper religious instructor of the boys. No one else can feel the same interest in them, and no one else (I am not speaking of myself personally, but merely by virtue of my situation) can speak to them with so much influence.¹

This letter has been the Headmaster's petition of right from that day; and, while securing the right to the pulpit for the clerical Headmaster in the older schools, it has stirred up the lay Headmaster in more recently founded schools not to give away the most powerful engine any master can have to act upon his boys. And nowhere has the wisdom of Arnold's pleadings been more fully justified than

¹ Stanley's *Life of Dr. Arnold*, 7th ed. p. 126.

by the use made of the office in Rugby Chapel by his successors.

So it was with Dr. Temple ; with all the attractiveness of his character to boys, his manliness, his sympathy and his justice, with all the wonder his masters felt for his organising ability, his stores of helpfulness and his marvellous power of work, it was the chapel that was the mainspring of his influence over all. It was not that his sermons were meant to be eloquent, though eloquent at times they were ; there was no touch of polish or of rhetoric, no purple passages that might provoke a smile in some youthful cynic ; there had been no time for elaboration, for on the Sunday afternoon the ink was scarce dry of the last sentence of the sermon when the warning sound of the school bell called him to chapel ; but it was the conviction of boys and men alike that compressed into that short address, perhaps lasting only a quarter of an hour, was the force by which they were to live till the next Sunday came round. Nor will any one who knew those days forget the abrupt close which came just when the attention was most earnest, and left the boys, not with the satisfaction of a sermon ended, but with a yearning feeling amounting at times to provocation—Why should he not go on ? Such is the testimony of masters and of boys. Thus Mr. Arthur Butler writes :—

No one indeed could listen to his sermons, in which a strong and noble nature so passionately pleaded for what was right, dear to God and good for man, without being deeply moved by them. The effect of them cannot be judged by merely reading them. It was the warm soul of a strong man speaking in the name of his Master (often with tears flowing down his cheeks), with the naturally somewhat harsh voice softened and vibrating with emotion, which stirred his young hearers like a trumpet-call. I have heard some old Rugbeians speak of them in a way that would sound to many an exaggeration. I have never heard any one question their

universal influence. When he brought out his first volume of sermons, which I had to pass, without corrections, through the Press, I said to him, "They will stir people strongly." "No," he said, "written sermons rarely do that; it is the man behind the sermon that stirs."

As a matter of fact, however, he was in those days a really great speaker. On one memorable occasion I heard him, in St. George's Hall at Liverpool, follow Gladstone and the Duke of Argyll: and there was little to choose between the effect that he produced and that of the two orators who preceded him. Perhaps it was this gift of eloquence, or rather the warmth of temperament which contributed to it, that led him, I thought, at times too much to flatter Rugbeian sentiment. It is a subject on which schoolboy patriotism is apt to exceed due limits; and, where a master strongly shares the school *esprit de corps*, it is easy for him also not always to observe the "happy mean." But the boys did not feel this. Rather they tried the more to live up to his appreciation of them; and young masters, fresh from the colder and severer style of the University, are apt to be over-critical.

No doubt, a great deal of the effect of the words came to the boys simply because it was he that was speaking, for there was a subtle sharing of the thoughts of his hearers that seemed to them like thought-transference:—

I could never take my eyes from his face from the first word of the sermon to the end, though I sat in a line with the pulpit by the old Schoolhouse seats.¹

So again:—

As for his more thoughtful eloquence, no man who ever heard him preach in Rugby Chapel on Good Friday² or Easter Day can ever forget the depth of conviction which vibrated in his voice; no boy who heard him analyse any particular type of character could fail to be struck by his penetration and subtlety; it was the problem of the Sunday talk in the Schoolhouse passages, how the Doctor could know such an infinite variety of assortments of character.

He never made the mistake, so often made by good men,

¹ W. O. Moberly.

² See Appendix, p. 244.—En.

of outrunning the religious feelings of those he had to teach ; he simply said what he knew, for he dreaded unreality, and he waited the result, not ashamed to say that he thought much religious zeal unhealthy.¹

So the head of the Schoolhouse in 1858 writes² :—

I remember going to him about the behaviour at house prayers which I wished to be more devout. "Thank you," he said, with his graver look, "I'll speak about it when I get the opportunity. I shan't forget ; but I must choose the right time. I am always afraid of outrunning the religious feeling of the boys."³

This carefulness not to be too much in evidence is illustrated by a letter to a parent who had raised the question of the boy's private prayers :—

I am much obliged (he writes from Rugby, October 2, 1861) for your hint about the prayers. Of course I keep a vigilant eye on such a matter. But one cannot do much more than prevent any interference with a boy who is saying his prayers, and endeavour to maintain in the public opinion of the school as strong a sense as possible of the duty.⁴

There is one chapel scene which is again and again recalled to old colleague and old boy alike, when they are asked what they remember as most characteristic of Dr. Temple's treatment of the school ; the answer is ever "the addresses before Communion."⁵

One scene (continues Mr. Arthur Butler) comes back to my mind while speaking on this subject. It was his custom to invite the boys who had been confirmed into chapel on the Saturday evening before Holy Communion. In the football season, the only time available was immediately after the match was over : and as the boys trooped into chapel from the field, in the evening light, heated and excited, in their foot-

¹ H. Lee Warner.

² E. G. Sandford.

³ *The Meteor*, February 25, 1903.

⁴ *Acland's Memoir and Letters*, p. 222.

⁵ E. H. Winnington Ingram ; boy, 1863-68.

ball dress, it was a striking sight to see them after a few minutes of calm, in the dimly lighted place, and after a few short and appropriate prayers had been said, lend themselves to the magic influence of the earnest, soul-stirring preacher. Never was he more eloquent than on these occasions; every eye was fixed on him. No one who did not then hear him can judge of what he was in his power over boys.¹

How well I can recall (writes E. A. Scott) how the simple, spare, black figure crept out of the study stairs with his old Bible in his hand, and slipped up into the pulpit. He never looked round him, and indeed there was nobody to see: it was often quite dark, and the boy football players came in after their match and slid, as he also did, into their seats.²

The power that he wielded on these occasions was the power of a man who, having his eyes on God, was not looking about for followers or converts, but was rapt as it were into a trance as he talked with his Creator.³

In the preparation of the boys for the annual Confirmation, Dr. Temple, while himself addressing the candidates collectively every week, yet made the housemaster, lay and cleric alike, responsible for the special preparation of their own boys. So, when the day came, it was the housemaster who joined the Headmaster in leading up each group of boys to the Bishop. A little thing, and yet typical of the hold which Temple maintained over the lay masters; they could not, if they would, he taught, escape, by not taking orders, the responsibility that must rest on them for their boys' souls, so long as they chose to remain schoolmasters.

The record of the Rugby period cannot be complete without some allusion to the cloud which came over it through the publication in 1860 of *Essays and Reviews*. This is not the place to deal with the Essay on the "Education of the World" which Temple wrote, nor with the part

¹ Arthur Butler.

² E. A. Scott.

³ H. Lee Warner.

he took in the publication of the book. What concerns us here is the view which he took of his duty to his boys in respect of it.

No doubt he, like others, undervalued the effects of the book and the notoriety it would attain. He had foreseen a certain amount of annoyance, but not the effect upon the boys. In a letter to a friend,¹ February 22, 1861, he writes :—

I for myself get precisely what I calculated on—a good deal of worry from panic-stricken parents²—but nothing at all that would otherwise vex and annoy me. . . . I think I made a blunder in one respect, and in one alone. I ought not to have done anything which would encourage those boys to plunge into critical speculations before their time. I did not realise the attractions that would be conferred upon a book for the boys, by my having written about it. Even that evil is not so great as it seems; certainly not beyond what a little care will set right.

Dr. Temple determined to set himself right with the boys and with the masters. He warned the Sixth Form as to the book,³ and he printed

¹ Letter to the Rev. Canon R. Lawson.

² See Dr. Jex Blake's paper, p. 176.

³ The following is a verbatim report of the words which he addressed on the subject to the Sixth Form: "Before I came to Rugby, before I thought of coming to Rugby, I was asked to write in that book; to have written in that book as Headmaster of Rugby would have been a blunder. It was perhaps a blunder in me not to reconsider my decision of letting the Essay be published when I came to Rugby, but inasmuch as it was a past act, it never occurred to me to reconsider it. I thought then, and I still think, even after what has happened, that that book ought to have been published. The book contains opinions which had long been lurking in corners; it was time they were dragged to light and faced. We, the Essayists, knew who were going to write, but we did not know what each was going to write about. We agreed each to write what he thought, and that we were only responsible for our own essay; this was clear to us all, because we knew before writing that we differed widely. In conclusion I would warn you against two things, against entering on the speculations contained in that book in a light or cursory way, and against supposing that I agree with all that is said in that book. I am sure you know me too well to suppose this for an instant."—Memorandum supplied by the Rev. F. H. Bowden Smith. Member of the Sixth Form, 1861. The words were taken down at the time.—En.

and published his school sermons unamended,¹ just as they had been written and preached. The simplicity of the preface tells of the strain it must have been to him to publish them.

I would gladly sacrifice every other aim (he writes) if by so doing I could help any of my pupils to live in the spirit of the Bible, and to love the Lord Jesus Christ.

The head of his house, to whom Mr. A. Butler pointed out this preface on the first appearance of the sermons, said in his hearty schoolboy manner—"That he would, that he would."

It came as a surprise to us (writes one of the then Sixth Form) who had been in his society during the publication of *Essays and Reviews*, and had absolutely failed to realise what he had felt, though we had defended him as fiercely as we knew how to our parents. Naturally he was not given to self-defence.

Often in his later life did this special trait come out; others he might, himself he would not defend. Yet in this case the welfare of the school and the actual incomes of his colleagues were at stake; so he would take them into his confidence, if no one else. The tale has been told by an eye-witness from notes taken at the time, and will be found in the following letter from Dr. Percival, the present Bishop of Hereford:—

THE PALACE, HEREFORD,
September 28, 1903.

DEAR KITCHENER—You ask me for some expression of opinion in regard to Dr. Temple's headmastership of Rugby, based on my experience as an assistant working under him.

The time, as you know, was very brief, only two years, and it is long ago. If you had asked me then, I might possibly have had some opinion to offer; but forty-one years

¹ See Preface of *Temple's Rugby Sermons*, First Series.—ED.

of varied experience since I left Rugby to begin my work as Headmaster of Clifton College have made me somewhat diffident about formulating any such appreciation.

As an incurable idealist, I may confess to you that I have never yet seen a school which was perfect even within the reasonable limits of attainable perfection. This much I may venture to say for the encouragement of the younger generation of schoolmasters. There is a good deal of unaccomplished work left for our successors to do; and, notwithstanding the veneration due to the great name of Arnold, I cannot say that Rugby, as I remember it in 1860-62, was a perfect school. It was a fine, strong, healthy, rough and vigorous, self-centred, and supremely self-confident society. We felt that we were breathing the strong and wholesome air which makes strong, brave, and efficient Englishmen; and, as I look back, I think we were right in the main.

It is, I believe, on record that when Carlyle paid a visit to Arnold, he described his house as a temple of industrious peace. It might, I think, have been described in our day as a nursery of the strenuous life. We lived under a chief whom we felt to be the embodiment of strength, vigour, truth, duty, unselfishness, all tempered by a domestic simplicity and a filial devotion to his aged mother which gave a tone of peculiar beauty to the life. The familiar photograph of Dr. Temple and his mother is to my mind quite as beautiful as any much-praised picture of Augustine and Monica.

More I will not endeavour to say, except that I should have been quite unfit to attempt the not altogether easy work of building up such a new school as Clifton College but for the lessons I had learnt and the experience I had gained under Temple at Rugby, whether in the schoolroom, or in the Close, or in familiar intercourse with a rare band of distinguished colleagues, among whom I was but a child; or, above all, in the chapel, Sunday by Sunday; for Temple held fast to the Arnoldian tradition that the Headmaster should speak to the school from his heart every Sunday. Whatever else our modern headmasters may change for the better, both they and their boys will suffer grave loss if they do not adhere to this practice.

There remains vividly pictured in my memory one incident of which I ought, perhaps, to give you some account, as it touches a matter of public interest, and you may possibly have no other record of it in your hands, although

there is still a small group of survivors out of the band of masters who on that occasion sat at the little square tables in the Sixth Form room, while Temple sat, intensely pale with suppressed emotion, in Arnold's seat.

It was in February 1861, if I remember right, when the ecclesiastical storms were raging very fiercely around the authors of *Essays and Reviews*. He was at that time, as at some other periods of his life, a silent man; but he had summoned a Masters' Meeting for the express purpose of speaking to us on this burning question, and what he said was to this effect:—

“I have called this meeting for the purpose of saying a few words on the subject of *Essays and Reviews*. Hitherto I have avoided speaking on the subject because I have thought it better that the masters should be able to say that nothing had passed between us; and also because I thought it better that I myself should be able, in speaking of any of the masters, to say honestly that they were entirely uncompromised. I have felt sure of sympathy, but I did not wish to embarrass you by introducing discussion. Now, however, the stir is so great that I think it my duty to make a few remarks.

“First, I must tell you that the book owes its origin to some conversations between Mr. Jowett and myself, as far back as eight or nine years ago, on the great amount of reticence in every class of society in regard to religious views. We frequently talked of the melancholy unwillingness of people to state honestly their opinions on points of doctrine, and I believe that I myself first raised the subject.

“We thought it might encourage free and honest discussion of Biblical topics if we were to combine with some others to publish a volume of *Essays*; and this idea gradually worked itself into the present reality. Several changes occurred in the group of men who agreed to write, so that some of the present essayists were not among those who originally agreed to join. There was one stipulation made, namely, that nothing should be written which was inconsistent with the position of ministers of our Church.

“I think I ought further to tell you that I saw none of the *Essays* except my own until I saw them in the book itself; and I believe that all the other writers were equally ignorant of what was written by any but themselves, with the exception of one who acted as editor, but had no control over what was written.

“With regard to my own part in the work, there is one thing, and only one, which makes me regret having published in the volume, and this is that as Headmaster here I made a mistake in doing so, a great mistake, on account of the boys, many of whom may be led to read the book because I wrote in it, before they ought to enter on such questions as are discussed in it; but so far as the Sixth is concerned, I hope to prevent its being thus read.

“I also made a mistake on account of the parents, to many of whom the outcry and panic must undoubtedly cause great anxiety and alarm.

“I do not wish to put myself in opposition to the ecclesiastical authorities who are set over us; but I must say that I cannot acquiesce in the manifesto of the bishops as being either just or fair, considering the way in which it appeared. I find that the address to which their manifesto was a reply animadverted only on two points, from both of which I can say that I most cordially differ, so that I feel their censure, when rightly understood, does not apply to myself, except indeed so far as my having published in the volume which contains these points may have given encouragement to their publication.

“I consider that there is injustice in the censure, as it has appeared, because it is unjust for those who have not compelled themselves to enter into the difficulties of the question to condemn others only on the strength of their general impressions or traditional beliefs; and it is also unjust that any one writing on such subjects should have hanging over him the possibility of a censure from a body of men who are guided by no fixed or plain rule of doctrine.

“The rules which constitute the boundaries of the Church ought to be drawn in such plain and distinct terms that every one might decide for himself whether he could honestly remain in the Church or not.

“With regard to the steps that I myself intend to take under present circumstances, I have to say that I propose to publish some of my sermons preached in the school chapel, but not at once, as I do not wish to do anything in a hurry.

“Although I differ widely from several things in the Essays, I cannot make any public declaration at present, as it would certainly be misconstrued into a condemnation of the book; and I most certainly cannot condemn any of the Essays, though I may differ from them, as that would run directly

contrary to the principles of toleration¹ which we advocate. Toleration is a word which to me has no meaning, unless it means to tolerate what we don't like and not only what we do like.

"To you I have one word to add with reference to my teaching of the Sixth Form. You all know what the preaching in chapel has been; and I can assure you that this is a fair specimen of what my teaching to the Sixth has been. If you had heard it, I believe you would say that it has been what you, as a body, would have taught or approved.

"Without alluding to *Essays and Reviews*, I have taken considerable pains to counteract what I consider to be erroneous in the book, and to discourage indulgence on the part of the young in such speculations as are treated therein. My last word is, that I feel deeply sorry on account of the boys for the mistake I made."

This account is what I jotted down in a note-book shortly afterwards, and I still remember saying to myself as I went from the meeting, down that winding staircase so familiar to every old member of the Rugby Sixth—*Mallet errare cum Platone quam cum inimicis ejus vera sentire*.

As we look back from the day of the sere and yellow leaf to that distant spring-time with all its promise, some of it garnered in the everlasting harvest home, and some of it unfulfilled, we feel that it was a good time, and that it was good to have lived in it, and in the daily presence of a great soul—a man as genuinely and truly good as he was great and strong.—Believe me, yours sincerely, J. HEREFORD.

While, therefore, Dr. Temple, as oftentimes in later days, refused to defend himself before the world that misunderstood him, he trusted his masters with his confidence, and trusted his boys with the pathetic request not to read his book. As

¹ Canon Wilson, who was also present at this Masters' Meeting, writes to Mr. Kitchener as follows:—"I should like to see the word *active* added before the word 'toleration' in the Bishop of Hereford's account of what Dr. Temple said. Temple drew a distinction between passive and active toleration, insisting on the latter as a duty, and as a duty the sense of which had led to the writing of such a joint work. I am perfectly certain of this word."

far as in him lay, Rugby should not suffer by what he had done.

In the summer of 1862 there was an exodus of masters: T. S. Evans to Durham; C. Evans to Birmingham; A. Butler to Haileybury; J. Percival to Clifton. Dr. Temple had set his eyes on a young Cambridge man to fill one of the vacancies.¹ Wilson had the courage to say straight out that he could not accept the offer because he could not serve under one of the writers of the Essays. The honesty of the answer doubtless convinced Temple that the man was even more worth having than he had thought; and a little later he renewed his offer, and proposed an interview. Wilson came down to Rugby, saw Temple, and was satisfied. Few men would have repeated the offer, and fewer have submitted themselves to cross-examination by a younger man.

Even amid all the trouble of this business, the humour of the man never failed him; a month later he writes to the same friend, Canon R. Lawson:—

The storm will blow over sooner or later, and then will come a reaction. Meanwhile, I think I have got the school on the right track. I can wait. . . . Will my sermons sell? I really think they may be useful if people will read them. But after such exciting work as this, they will be pronounced dull. Netta (Miss Temple) yesterday had a letter enclosing a piece written by an unknown lady, to the effect that she was ready to be burnt any day with Dr. Temple.

¹ W. Knyvett Wilson, who was unfortunately killed in Switzerland, on the Riffelhorn, in the summer of 1865.

CHAPTER VIII

HOME LIFE AT RUGBY

The home *régime*—Memorandum by the Bishop's nephew, Mr. W. O. Moberly—Dr. Temple's mother—Miss Temple and the Schoolhouse.

It remains to gather up the fragments of the life at Rugby that have fallen through the meshes of the preceding chapters. It has been the aim in the foregoing pages, not so much to criticise the life, as to reproduce the atmosphere in which it was lived. There must have been something unusual, if not unique, in the way Dr. Temple was regarded by those around him : there does not appear to have existed at Rugby that spirit of constant criticism of the Headmaster's sayings and doings which is a usual factor in a school circle, though not inconsistent, be it understood, with great respect and even affection on the part of the critics. At Rugby the spirit of criticism was suspended. How otherwise could a colleague,¹ by no means uncritical of other men, write after forty years :—

I loved him too much to criticise, even. It never occurred to me he could be wrong : he was so fertile and so conciliating to everybody and on every point. I never thought of anything relating to questions which came up which I did not find he actually had considered and given his true weight to before I spoke.

¹ E. A. Scott.

Others could say the same. It may not have been altogether a healthy state of affairs, but so it appears to have been ; the reaction was sure to be strong when the period came to an end, but while it lasted its characteristic was one of unquestioning and unquestioned content.

In his own private life Dr. Temple set an example of ready hospitality, but withal of frugal ways. The younger masters had especial cause to be grateful for the lesson thus taught. Most of them Fellows of their college, many of them bachelors, they were enjoying an income far above their needs ; the temptation to a luxurious life might have been a strong one, had the example been different at the Schoolhouse. There the table was always open to guests, but the fare did not seem to vary whoever might happen to be present. At that time Dr. Temple had not become a total abstainer ; nor did he for some years after he came to Rugby take up the Temperance cause, of which he was to be in later life the leader ; but, even then, the eating and the drinking were a mere accident of the meeting : the talk, especially at the host's end of the table, was the *raison d'être* of the gathering.

You will not forget (writes a friend) the dinner-parties at the Schoolhouse twice a week : they were often monotonous, as was necessary when you met the same men again and again ; but the astonishing versatility of the host was what has since surprised me. Often somebody was down staying with him, always somebody worth having met. But it was always he who drew the stranger out.

Perhaps the pleasantest meal was the afternoon tea on the Sunday. The Headmaster, after preaching to the boys at the four o'clock service, returned in his most genial mood, and was the life of an inner circle of friends.

While his life was marked by a somewhat

Spartan simplicity, his generosity in many matters was accepted as axiomatic. When, in 1867, he was about to subscribe a sum which to him, for he was at no time of his life a rich man, was a sacrifice, he was afraid lest the sending round of a list might lead some of the masters into giving more than they ought; hence he asked each to put down the figure of his proposed subscription on a piece of paper, and to throw it into a master's cap. The new quadrangle was built with that cap's contents.

Thus the school circle lived a little life of its own, but occasionally events from the outer world affected it. Thus, in the early sixties, there was an exceptional influx of American boys into the school. This arose from two reasons—first, the popularity in America of *Tom Brown's School Days* induced Americans to visit the school and even to send their sons there; and, secondly, at a later date, during the war in America between North and South, more boys than usual came to Rugby, as to other English schools, to be educated. The interest these Americans took in the school took tangible shape when a banner, worked by American ladies, was brought to the school and formally presented.¹ Another indirect action of the same war upon the school was the interest excited throughout the school by the cotton famine in Lancashire. In the relief of the operatives Dr. Temple took a leading part, hurrying to Lancashire to meetings, and returning to tell the boys what he had seen.

During the years 1865-68 Dr. Temple was frequently occupied with attendance in London at meetings of the Schools Inquiry Commissioners.² This was not allowed to affect the work of the school, which was carried on without noticeable inconvenience. Beyond the fact that certain

¹ Bradley's *Rugby*, p. 151.

² See "Education Office" Memoir, pp. 133-147.—ED.

classical lessons to the Sixth Form devolved upon Mr. Potts,¹ then the Headmaster's assistant in classics, the Headmaster managed to be always to the fore at his usual times. The effect was rather seen in the increased interest he took in every branch of the school-work, which was stimulated by the problems that were brought before him as a Commissioner. This double work could not, however, be done without a great strain on Dr. Temple, both in body and in mind. Thus, in a letter to Mr. Lee Warner in 1868, he says :—

I am working my brains into puddles with this Report. Verily a grateful country will never know all my patriotism.

In 1867 came an event long looked for by the school, the three hundredth anniversary of the foundation of the school. The day was celebrated by a service attended by many old Rugbeians, when Dr. Temple preached a characteristic sermon from 1 Cor. xii. 26. A dinner, presided over by Dean Stanley, followed, and in a speech in which he was thanking the then dying Trustees for what they had done for him, Dr. Temple spoke of his work there in the retrospect as he had before spoken of it when it was in the future, as the work he would have chosen more than any other work in the world.

Perhaps we may be allowed here to look a little more closely at the home life. Scott, of Balliol, had written in 1857 :—

He is a true lover of young people ; and, as a consequence, all young people learn to love him. I never knew a boy or girl who was a day in his company without adopting him as a playfellow.²

This side of his nature showed itself at Rugby

¹ Alexander William Potts, master, 1862-70. Afterwards the first Headmaster of Fettes College.

² Testimonials in favour of Rev. F. Temple, p. 21.

whenever the stress of work relaxed its hold over him. His nephew, W. O. Moberly, writes of the days when he entered the school in 1862, at the age of eleven :—

I spent a great part of my afternoons with him in the Close before I came to the school, and especially when there were football matches going on. He used to laugh at me afterwards for my craze for games; but I think he did a good deal to make me care for them, though not to make me put them in their wrong place. I think, perhaps, the school would have been astonished if they had seen the Headmaster playing football with me in the garden on the other side of the Barby Road, and sometimes taking me up in his arms, while the ball was in mine, and carrying me behind my own goal line, while I shrieked with all my might that it was unfair.

Whenever Dr. Temple was with nephews and nieces, whether in girls' cricket in the farther garden, or in merry games in the Schoolhouse, he was the life and the soul of the party, "making them tenfold more delightful." It was in these years that Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland* came out, and this he would read to the young people with such zest and spirit that the whole party laughed till they cried.

Nor was his joyousness and fun at this time kept for his own kith and kin. The boys would come in to some meal, or perhaps to that delightful institution—Sunday high tea. Despite the evening dress that was even in the holidays obligatory at this family meal, the boys were made happy, and talked freely to him, and looked as if they loved to listen to what he said. With his younger masters, too, he has left memories of sunny laughter mixed with serious talk.

The year 1866 was saddened to him by the death of Mrs. Temple, on May 8 of that year, and the breaking of that intimate tie, the

peculiar strength of which has been dwelt on by more than one of the writers in this volume. At Rugby Mrs. Temple had lived chiefly in her bedroom in the daytime, unless she went out in her chair. In the afternoon the son and daughter had five-o'clock tea in her bedroom, and at that time Dr. Temple would be at the height of his laughter and fun. During dinner the mother came down into the drawing-room, and was ready to receive the guests on their leaving the dining-room. Perhaps she might be found playing dominoes with one of the grandchildren.¹ Dr. Temple would then go over to his mother in her chair by the fireside, and, leaning down to her, introduce each of us to her. Such a look as he would give her has been happily caught for us in the garden photograph. Before prayer-time she would, latterly, retire to her room, but her grand-daughter, who slept in an adjoining room, would hear Dr. Temple come up to his mother's room, and read by her bedside the 51st Psalm, the Collect for the twenty-first Sunday after Trinity, and the Lord's Prayer, and then, without more words, leave her to her rest.

Throughout all the time at Rugby, Miss Temple lived at the Schoolhouse, managed the household, and cared for every member of the little world, boys or masters, or perhaps most of all for the masters' wives, to some of whom she was a veritable second mother. An old Schoolhouse boy,² whose brother died while a boy at school in 1865, and who in this time of trouble had full opportunity of knowing her, writes thus of Miss Temple:—

I for one have grateful memories of Miss Temple, who

¹ I used to play with her, and recall the grave kindness of her tone in speaking. Her son would watch the game, and, as in after years in the case of Patience, would point without saying anything.
—Ed.

² Rev. L. R. Whigham.

regularly came into the sick-room to see how the boys were getting on. Many days used I to be laid up there, and I think it was then that I began to understand the character of that sister of the Doctor's who kept his house then, and subsequently his palace at Exeter, and made every old Rugbeian, but especially every old Schoolhouse boy, feel that he was wholly and heartily welcome. My own personal regard and reverence for Miss Temple broadened and deepened as the years went by, and as a curate in the Diocese of Exeter, it was my privilege to be the first of the old Rugbeians of his own time to be ordained by the "dear great master whom we loved so well." Till ill-health obliged her to leave Exeter, Miss Temple's unchanging kindness, begun to me in the Schoolhouse days, made the palace at Exeter a home in the west to the young curate.

It was perhaps not at first that Miss Temple won the hearts of the Rugby people: there may have been a feeling of self-assertion which rose up in somewhat mutinous feelings against what they thought the benevolent despotism of the Schoolhouse. But it required only to be in need to learn the great heart that lay behind, and to accept with devotion the large share Miss Temple took in the whole life of the place. An extract from a letter written by Dr. Temple to his sister in 1874 will show what she became to those at Rugby, and will give some idea how intimate was the tie that bound brother and sister together at this time. The Bishop had come down to see his old friends and Rugby, and writes thus on the Sunday night, after preaching in the school chapel:—

The day is over. Both days are over. I have said my good-byes and must depart to-morrow at eight in the morning. Taken all in all, nothing could be more successful. I do not think there has been a single drawback.

So you see how my days have been spent. And the bright faces, and the affectionate words, and the buoyant manner, and the trusting looks, these I cannot describe, for words do not describe them.

And all the time . . . you do not know how I missed you, and how I felt that it was all robbed of its crown because you were not here. Love was sent to you from every face and every tongue, and none called the gathering perfect without remembering one thing was wanting.

CHAPTER IX

LEAVING RUGBY

The last Sunday—The farewell concert—Subsequent connexion with the school.

APPENDIX—Rugby sermon : Good Friday.

IN July 1869 a vacancy occurred in the Deanery of Durham, involving with it the Wardenship of the University, and on the 23rd Mr. Gladstone offered the office to Dr. Temple, coupled with an intimation that he would not be allowed to remain there long without being solicited to go elsewhere. Dr. Temple refused to leave Rugby. In the absence of Dr. Temple's own letters,¹ the motives which led to his refusal may be gathered from a letter which Dr. Farrar, Professor of Divinity in Durham University, writes, urging him to accept the Prime Minister's expected offer :—

There are many other grounds of usefulness on which I should wish you to be at Durham rather than Rugby on which I will not enter. The tone of your letter, I mean the way in which you simply ask your conscience whether you can do most good at Rugby or at Durham, whether duty says stay or go, is just what I expected from you, and is the best pledge to me that I have not been mistaken in my estimate of him to whom I am writing.

But Dr. Temple was not to remain long at Rugby. Mr. Gladstone had already made up his mind to offer Dr. Temple a bishopric. In a letter

¹ But see "Exeter" Memoir, pp. 274, 275.—Ed.

in August to a mutual friend, Sir T. D. Acland, the Prime Minister wrote :—

I have made up my mind to act on a fitting opportunity. But the choice of it requires care. It does not seem to be your opinion, but it is mine, that when the time comes there will be a great outcry.¹

Accordingly Acland is commissioned to sound Dr. Temple as to whether he “will be available before long, if necessary, and as he hopes within a moderate time.”²

And the writer urges Temple to say that the reasons which led him to decline Durham do not stand in the way of his giving full consideration to any other offer that may be made to him before very long.

It was only too soon for Rugby that the time spoken of by Mr. Gladstone came. In September the bishopric of Exeter fell vacant, and the Prime Minister offered it to Dr. Temple. Again the balance of contending duties had to be measured, and this time the other scale went down; conscience said “Go.” Meanwhile, the happy family at Rugby had known nothing of what the Prime Minister was intending, and the blow fell with startling suddenness. What he himself felt at leaving Rugby may be seen from the letter he wrote to Mrs. Arnold :—

RUGBY, October 10, 1869.

MY DEAR MRS. ARNOLD—Thank you very much for your kind words. You may believe that to leave this place almost tears me in two. I have met with such kindness here, such hearty support, such generous allowance for difficulties. And I doubt much if I shall be quite as happy again. But it seems a duty to go, and so I am going. Yet as long as I live I shall not forget Rugby, nor the great soul

¹ *Memoir and Letters of Sir Thomas Dyke Acland*, edited by his son, p. 243.

² Letter from Sir T. D. Acland to Dr. Temple.

who still seems to live here, and from whose memory I have learnt so much.—Very truly yours, F. TEMPLE.

This is not the place to discuss the outcry which the appointment raised. What the masters felt in their compulsory silence may be gathered somewhat from the following verses from a poem in which one of them¹ vented his feelings at the time. The poem was, however, never published till both men had passed away :—

.
 Their dead hearts shall yet be living ;
 They shall know what we are giving ;
 They shall love thee with the loving of thy Schoolhouse towers ;
 For our loss we give thee sadly
 For our cause we give thee gladly.
 When was ever gladdest loss so sad a gain as ours ?

.
 But the flame that shineth through thee
 Most is ours, that nearest knew thee ;
 Not again can others know, nor others love as we.

Nor is it the place or the time to discuss the dispute that arose over the selection of Dr. Temple's successor. It is not part of Dr. Temple's history. But the tenseness of feeling at Rugby at the close of 1869 cannot be realised without some allusion to these two topics, which filled the newspapers of the time, and could not fail to split Rugby into hostile camps.

It was this which gave to the leave-taking a feeling which, had no allusion been made to these matters, might have been thought hysterical. Dr. Temple preached his farewell sermon in the chapel on the last Sunday of the term ; crowds of old Rugbeians occupied every available seat. Dean Stanley, who was there, writes to Sir Thomas Acland on December 13 :—

¹ James Robertson, master, 1862-72 ; afterwards Headmaster of Haileybury. See *Arachnia, Occasional Verses*, by James Robertson, p. 39. (*To F. T., "but not sent to him."*)

I was, fortunately, at Rugby. I felt as if new life would be passed into the Church by the sound of that voice, the sight of that face, the fragrance of that character.¹

A writer in the *Pall Mall Gazette*, who, it was an open secret, was "Tom Brown" himself,² describes the scene thus:—

The chapel was unable to contain the crowd of old Rugbeians who attended. Amongst those who were present, both at the morning and afternoon services, were three sons of Arnold. It was Communion Sunday, and an old Rugbeian who was present,³ and had not been present for a quarter of a century before, remembered that in his time generally the Sixth Form, with one or two exceptions, and a sprinkling of perhaps from forty to fifty in the rest of the school, stayed. To his astonishment yesterday some 230 boys kept their places, and it was touching to see how all of them tried to get to the end of the rails at which the Doctor was officiating. He, before commencing the service, standing on the raised altar-step, upon Arnold's grave, had said:—

"This is the last time I shall receive the Holy Communion with you as Headmaster of this school. I beg of you all to remember me in your prayers to-day."

The sermon was, as usual, at the afternoon service, following the hymn⁴ for the last Sunday before the holidays, which ends:—

Let Thy Father-hand be shielding
All who here shall meet no more,
May their seed-time past be yielding
Year by year a richer store.

The singing of this will not be easily forgotten. The sermon⁵ was on Gal. vi. 2: "Bear ye one another's burthens, and so fulfil the law of Christ."

"This," said the preacher, "new commandment of Christ, this law of love, which Paul is here referring to, our Lord

¹ *Memoir and Letters of Sir T. D. Acland*, by his son, A. Acland, p. 278.

² *Pall Mall Gazette*, December 18, 1869.

³ Probably G. Hughes, brother of the writer.

⁴ Written by the Rev. H. J. Buckoll, assistant master at Rugby, 1826-71, under six Headmasters.

⁵ For this sermon, see Temple's *Rugby Sermons*, 1867-69, 3rd series, p. 281. Its conclusion, given in the text, has been corrected from the version afterwards published.

and the Apostles place above all other commandments. How is this? The older dispensation had placed the fear and love of God first, then the love of neighbours. Surely the highest rule must be to love first God, then truth, holiness, justice, and after these one another. Has the Gospel sunk below the law? No, for under the Gospel, by the incarnation of the Son of God, the two loves are united, can no longer be kept apart. There can be no love of God apart from love of man. Christ Himself has pointed out this love of each other as the special mode by which He would have us acknowledge Him. Let us help one another, then, at our Lord's call, by courage, by patience, by cordial and tender sympathy in joy and sorrow, by faithful warning, by resignation. There are no bounds to the help which spirit can give to spirit in the intercourse of a noble life. When parted, we can still bear one another's burdens by hearty, mutual trust. There is nothing which gives more firmness and constancy to the life of a man than loyal trust in absent friends."

At this point the preacher paused for some seconds. In the chapel (crowded up to the altar-rails by old Rugbeians, for whom rows of chairs had been brought in from the vestry) the hush was intense and painful, until, in tones which strangely brought back Arnold to those who had heard him there as boys, the preacher went on, as nearly as we can recall words which struck like pistol-shots:—

"The time has come when we are to part. For twelve years have I laboured here. The lines of the work were laid down by a great servant of the Lord when I was yet a boy, and others followed him and did their part, and now I have taken my turn in building up the spiritual temple which Arnold first planted. I have seen many go away to other scenes and other duties, as God's providence ordained. And now I go myself. But though we shall be parted, yet we can still help each other. Still that self-sacrifice to duty which Arnold taught and lived, still that preference for the true, and the pure, and the just, and the good, to all else whatever it may be, still the eye fixed steadily on the will of our Master Christ, may be the ideal at which we aim and bind us close together. Still may we be true to each other's friendship, and true to the Christian principles that we have professed to live by, and if so we shall assuredly help in bearing each other's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ. Let us pray."

And so the teacher, whose loyalty to his Lord and his brethren men are impugning, left his work to be judged by his Master, careless, as all true servants should be, of every other judgment. Let him take courage. The judgment of all who have taken part in, or known that work, is with him already; and, if not sooner, yet when his life's work is over, the cry will go up from a grateful and a sorrowing nation, as it rose over Arnold's early grave, "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

The above account, written by one whose name will always be associated with Arnold's Rugby, seems to unite the work of the two great masters, Arnold and Temple. The tenseness of feeling with which this last scene of Temple's spiritual work at Rugby ended was not one whit exaggerated in this account written on the day itself. An incident at the close of this service throws light on the question whether the love of the Headmaster extended beyond the Sixth Form and those brought into personal contact with him. A master sitting in a back transept noticed, as the Middle School boys filed out, that one boy remained as if ill. On going to his help he found the tall, six-foot lad prostrate with uncontrollable sobs. He had never been taught by Temple, he was not in his house, he had probably never had six words with him in his life—and yet the sense of parting broke down the schoolboy's reserve, and forced him to expose his emotion before his brethren. If ever a master was loved by his boys it was he.

The usual school concert, a few nights later, gave Dr. Temple a chance of saying good-bye in a less formal manner. An ode had been composed by one old Rugbeian, James Rhoades, and set to music by another, Sir Herbert Oakeley¹; when the usual *Carmen Feriale* had been sung the audience rose again to their feet, and, as Dugdale sang the solo

¹ See *The Life of Sir Herbert Oakeley*, by E. M. Oakeley.

parts of the ode the effect was electrical. There are many who were there that night who will be glad to recall the scene when they read the following lines :—

Master, best beloved and best,
Ours for ever, as to-night,
Hands at parting may be press'd,
Tears reluctant dim the sight;
But where'er thy name be known,
Rugby hails thee first her own.

England take from us to-day
One more man of mighty mould:
Could we think to cheat thee? nay,
Such thy hero-type of old;
Strong and tender now as then,
Joy of youth and tower of men.

No one who was present (writes an eye-witness)¹ will forget the fierce disclaimer with which Dr. Temple sprang to his feet when the ode was finished. "It is impossible," he said, using one of his favourite phrases, "that such words can be deserved," and then went on to say his last farewell to the school that has ever claimed him as her own.

So ended his connexion with the school as Headmaster, but his loving service to the school ended only with his life. In 1871 the University of London elected the Bishop of Exeter their representative on the Governing Body when formed according to the new constitution. In 1891 he became chairman of the Board, and remained so to the day of his death. No pressure of work prevented his giving his time and attention to Rugby matters.

Certainly (Dr. James, the present Headmaster, writes to me) the Archbishop's work as chairman of the Governing Body deserves hearty recognition. He was always there, and his power of grasping a situation involving many complex local details struck me greatly. He was always ready to come to any special function, even in the busy summer.

¹ H. Lee Warner.

Among the occasions of these visits to Rugby were the delivery of a series of addresses to public schoolmasters in Rugby Chapel in January 1891, the unveiling of portraits of Thomas Hughes and Arthur Clough in the new Big School in March 1894, and the unveiling of the bust of Dr. Arnold in February 1897. In October 1898 he dedicated a memorial window in the chapel to Dr. Goulburn, his predecessor in the headmastership, and at the same time unveiled a medallion to Dr. Benson, formerly an assistant master at Rugby and his predecessor in the Archbishopric of Canterbury. In June of the following year Dr. Temple unveiled the statue of Mr. Thomas Hughes by Mr. Brock, the sculptor, and made a characteristic speech.

His last visit to Rugby was on July 30, 1902, the year of his death; he then unveiled the West Window and the Matthew Arnold medallion in chapel. The day was marked by a slight incident. On the way down to Rugby, at Woodford Station, on the Great Central line, there was some doubt among those coming to Rugby as to whether the train would stop at Rugby or not. An old Rugbeian passing the carriage caught sight of the Archbishop, and cried out loudly, "We are all right; there's the Headmaster." The old title gave Dr. Temple great delight, taking him back thirty years, and when he reached the Schoolhouse he saluted Dr. James with the inquiry, "Do you know who I am? I'm the Headmaster." So true did his heart beat to Rugby to the last.

And yet Rugby matters were, when he was at Fulham or at Lambeth, the straw that would have broken the camel's back if he had been any other man. One day can be vouched for as a sample. After correspondence at Fulham, appointments at London House, the opening of a Home in the East, and the preaching of a sermon and attending

a temperance meeting in the West of London, we drove back to Fulham to find Dr. Percival, then Headmaster of Rugby, waiting for him, though it was nearly midnight, to discuss the matters on the agenda for the morrow's meeting of the Governing Body.

To Rugby he paid the greatest tribute a father can pay to a school by sending both his sons to be taught there. In declining years he seemed to dwell with even more affectionate interest on the old Rugby stories. It was impossible to be inaccurate in recalling the tale; years of work among other men and other things had not dimmed his recollection of one name or one face, any more than it had lessened his hearty laugh at the old joke, or led him to rise up with less fire in defence of the old and absent Rugby friend.

Other writers will lay stress on the work of Frederick Temple elsewhere and at other times; but Rugbeians must be forgiven if they are firm in their faith that his best work was done for the school of Lawrence Sheriffe, and for the public-school system of England. It will not be forgotten that his almost dying effort in the House of Lords was to point out the inadequacy of the Education Bill of 1902 to provide the supply of secondary education that the needs of the nation demanded. However great the pressure of other calls in later life, he never ceased to care for the old work. He had put his hand to the plough when he went to Rugby, and he never looked back.¹

¹ For commentary on the Rugby period, see Editor's Supplement, vol. ii. chap. iii. "Power."—En.

APPENDIX

GOOD FRIDAY¹

A Sermon preached in Rugby School Chapel by FREDERICK TEMPLE,
D.D., *Chaplain-in-ordinary to Her Majesty, and Headmaster of
Rugby School.*

“I drew them with cords of a man, with bands of love.”—
HOSEA xi. 4.

THIS is not a day for difficult doctrines, but for the simplest and humblest feelings. The great work of this day is beyond the reach of our understanding. What it was that was done for us we are not able to comprehend, nor why it was needed to be done. There was much that was mysterious, but it is not the mystery that we find the chief topic in the account four times repeated of our Lord's last days and death. In very plain language the facts are minutely told. The doctrines we hardly see. The appeal is not made to our understanding, nor even directly to our conscience. With the cords of a man we are drawn. The human affections in which all men share, the feelings which even the poorest, the meanest, the most ignorant partake in, the pity, the tenderness, the love that can only be called forth by love, these are now the cords by which our Father draws us, the cords of a man. Not our admiration for greatness, nor for energy of soul; not our reverence for wisdom, seeing into secret things, and forcing conviction on us as it speaks. We see not here that which makes our hearts applaud. We dare not here admire as we should an ordinary man. He whom we think of is above our admiration. If He is calm and dignified before a weak judge and an angry mob, yet His bearing has no proud consciousness that many eyes are on Him, and that He has a high part to play. All this is out of place. The

¹ *Supra*, p. 217.—ED.

dignity is the dignity of a simple purpose, of a mind too lost in other thoughts to have room for any thoughts of self. We can admire St. Paul before the Sanhedrin, or before the magistrates at Philippi. But here we cannot feel admiration. It is not a great man whose history we are reading. It is not greatness of soul or commanding will ; to call it noble-minded does not express our feeling. We cannot think of this history at all in the same way that we do of those tales of noble endurance which sometimes make our hearts beat quick. There are times in our Lord's life when we can find passages that seem like touches of what we call greatness, the indignation which denounced the woes on the wicked party that ever resisted God's work, or the sternness which reproved the ruler of the synagogue who forbid men to come and be healed. But here we find no trace of such feeling ; not even of that anger which a man might feel at treachery and falsehood. Here is not the will that compels men to bow down before it. His bearing is not the bearing of a strong man resolute in his purpose. His resolution is not of that kind which triumphs in opposition, and rejoices in victory. In all human greatness there is something like exaltation in the strength that makes the greatness. But here we see nothing of this. Not to high feelings does it speak ; not to the man who is conscious of a lofty purpose nobly followed ; not to him who rests with complacency on the thoughts of his own success, or his own struggles for the right. If such thoughts are ever right, they cannot enter here. To the heart that loves like a child, to the sinner deeply laden with his burden of unhappiness, to the broken spirit that secretly longs to escape from fetters which it is powerless to break, to the soul that is ready to despair, yes, to the thief and murderer at the hour of public doom, this Gospel speaks, and tells of hope, and love, and eagerness to forgive, and embracing arms, and falling on the neck, and tears of joy, and the welcome of the Prodigal Son.

We cannot study here. We can but surrender our hearts to the love which is too much for them to contain. We have not to brace ourselves up with much and hard endeavour. We have not to clear our hearts of folly, and to prepare to receive hard sayings. We have not by much meditation to arrive at truths too deep for common understandings. We need no hard words, or well-taught minds, or sharpened heads. The wretchedest sinner that ever longed for death to free him from his anguish, most ignorant and darkened soul

that can hardly understand human language, can here find what will speak to him, as his mother's caresses once did in his childhood, as nothing has ever spoken to him since. The soul that never could make the effort to aim at what was noble, the mind that could never take in a wider reach of thought than his own poor daily life, are here on a level with the wisest and the noblest. They, too, are drawn, as all are drawn, with the cords of a man, with the cords of human love by a loving Father. When all else has failed ; when examples fail to rouse them, and precepts fail to guide them ; when sin has proved too strong for reasoning, for the sight of the wretchedness it brings with it, for fear of hell hereafter, for bitter experience of hell here ; when we have fought and been beaten, and at last have given up hope ; when our hearts are grown too cold for words of eloquence to reach them ; when we have settled down despairingly in sinful habits, still fretting inwardly at the horror that lies before us ; even then the Cross of Christ may yet save us with its simple story ; if we have strength for nothing else, we yet may have strength to fling ourselves at the foot of the Cross ; to think not of the future but of the past ; to live, not in resolutions of amendment, but in love of Christ ; for He loved us and gave Himself to die for us.

We are sometimes cold and dead. There are times when our feelings towards God seem to lose their warmth. Perhaps we neglect our prayers ; or perhaps we repeat them carelessly as a matter of form, even an irksome form. We wander to various thoughts and never fix our minds on God. We are not easy. We feel not quite happy. And we wonder at our own dryness and hardness. We wish for any state of mind rather than what we have. In the midst, perhaps, of outward activity our religious life seems listless and dull. We almost long to rush into open sin, fancying that the excitement of that will be better than our present lethargy. We are weary, and yet we know not the way to better things. We cannot resolve, and we procrastinate, and say to-morrow, or by-and-by. Or we try to turn our eyes another way and not think about it. Sometimes, indeed most often, all is not right with us when things are so : we are doing something wrong, and we know it. Sometimes we are not conscious of anything like that ; we only know that we feel nothing to draw us to God ; we see reason enough for serious thoughts, but our hearts seem turned to summer dust, and we cannot love. We can obey, and we do, but we feel like servants, not like children,

and we are unhappy because we cannot rouse any warmer feelings in ourselves.

And when this is so, where can we go but to the Cross of Christ? Can our hearts long resist the pleading of that story, or can we refuse to come when the Father begins to draw us with the cords of a man, with bands of love?

Perhaps under a decent exterior we hide some sinful habit which has long been eating into our souls. It is possible that we may be discharging every duty as far as human eyes behold us. We may even have better thoughts at times, and offer up most earnest prayers. We may be most sincere in our wish to serve God, and may have striven long and hard to subdue what is evil in us. Perhaps it is a fault which leaves us entirely free sometimes, and gives us leisure to prepare our hearts against it. And yet time after time the temptation has proved too strong, or we have been found too weak. We have slipped back again we hardly can tell how; and sin reigns unopposed. Unclean thoughts return upon us and we indulge them; or it may be an unkind temper makes us harsh to those around us; or a foolish tongue wanders from the truth; or indolence overpowers our will, and we spend in some pleasure the time that ought to have been devoted in honest labour; or conceit makes us say and do things of which we ought to be ashamed; or angry pride has filled our souls even in the presence of God. Our besetting sin has clung to us, and we cannot get rid of it. At times we seem to have won the victory; we are ready to exclaim, "I shall never be removed: Thou, Lord, of Thy goodness hast made my hill so strong." And then the enemy has found us in an unguarded moment, and when once we give way our strength to resist seems lost. Has not this happened again and again, not once only but many times, and are not we tempted to make no effort in what seems a hopeless case? We have resolved, and resolved again, and have prayed to God for aid, and we have endeavoured to watch ourselves, and have avoided many occasions which experience had told us were dangerous. And it has been all in vain. And now if this be so, yet once more let us turn to God, and gaze upon the Cross of Christ. Let us not on this day make resolutions, or look forward in anticipation of battle. Let us think only of that sorrow which was beyond all other sorrows, and that love which caused all the sorrow. Let us think of our Lord sadly grieving at our weakness, and longing to help us, and praying for our recovery. Let us think

of the bitter pain for Him to look forward, and see how little all His pain and toil would teach us. What is bitterer than to love, and to love fondly, and to see one whom you love descend step by step into sin and folly? And this He saw, and yet His love was not made cold or feeble. And His bodily frame was weak, so weak that the fear of what was coming, and the weight of His sorrow, brought from Him the bloody sweat and the prayer which He knew could not be granted. And yet He shrunk not away from what He had undertaken. Let us look on this until our thoughts are filled with the sight, till our hearts answer to the affection which thus could suffer, till we feel the cords draw us, the cords of a man, and we sit at the foot of the Cross, and never wish to leave it. Let us carry this with us henceforward, and turn to this whenever we are sore beset. It cannot be in vain that all this love was shown.

Or perhaps we have never really striven to serve God at all. We have lived as best suited the society in which we were, as most conduced to our own pleasure. The garden of our soul has been filled with noxious weeds, and we have never endeavoured to root them out. We have never prayed alone. We have but given our presence to the common prayers of Christians. And in church our thoughts have not turned to God, but have wandered to pleasures, to worldly hopes, to dreams pleasant to our fancy. We have thought little about another world. We have thought little about the hour of death and the day of judgment. We are not wicked in the world's sense of wicked. We commit no murder or theft. We break no human laws. We respect all the rules of society. But whenever the thought of God or conscience comes across us, we immediately find that but a dull subject to think on, and we turn to pleasanter and more exciting themes.

What, then, shall warm our hearts but this plain story of sadness? If we have human feelings still left us, and sympathy can yet touch our souls, it will be impossible to read of the Cross of Christ without emotion. Let us follow our Lord from the Supper table, where His betrayer ate with Him out of the same dish; to the garden where He prayed for what He knew He could not and would not have; to the judgment hall where the people of His love cried out, "Crucify Him, crucify Him!"; to the cross where He seemed to have been forsaken by God, as He had been forsaken by all men. Here shall all men find a medicine to heal their

sore disease. Who could sin in the presence of this depth of suffering? Who could refuse to be touched at heart? Proud thoughts, self-conscious contentment, cannot stand here. Cold hearts, callous feelings, must either turn away or melt; and alas, that so many should turn away. The sinner and the saint may here kneel down side by side; for the love which flows from those wounds washes the sinner as clean as the saint. We cannot cleanse ourselves. O Christ, do Thou cleanse us, as we kneel before Thee. Here may come the sinner sure of acceptance. He may have felt quite unable to sell all and follow Christ preaching and Christ working miracles. He may have been unconvinced by all the wisdom of the parables. The threats and the warnings, nay, the promises of mercy and the moving words may have found his ears dull of hearing. But here he will kneel and think no more of himself, but only of his Lord, and be lost in the memory of this dark time. When nothing else has converted the sinner, this many times has been too much for him, and many times will it be again.

We come not here with desire to stand right in God's sight. We come not thinking of His justice, and asking to be made holy, that His justice may have nothing to find fault with. We come not asking to be spared His wrath. Who could ask for anything for himself in the presence of all this suffering, all this suffering on his behalf? No; we come asking to be taken to His heart; for the love of a Father we beg, for the pardon which brings us to His bosom; not for that pardon which only spares the rod; we cannot here think of punishment; we cannot ask simply that our own pains shall be lessened; we do not think of that, but of Christ. We have been away from Him. We long to come back to Him. Lord, receive us once more to Thy love and do with us what Thou wilt.

We come as sheep that have gone astray. We hasten to the Shepherd whose voice we hear calling from afar. He hath sought us long. We think not of the pastures, but of Him; to lie in His bosom, to be carried in His arms, to hear His words of comfort once more, to see His face, to feel that we are pressed to His heart.

We come as the Prodigal Son. We think not of the pleasure of our Father's house. We think not of the joys which belong to the saints. We think not of heaven nor of hell now. We think of Him, of our Father. We long once more to be near Him, to see Him, to hear Him, if that at

least may be ours which we so little deserve. We come not asking for holiness, nor for forgiveness, nor for happiness, nor for peace, nor for protection. We come asking to be let once more to live with Him, and for nothing else. Christ is all in all, and here we can think of nothing else; if only we may be permitted kneeling at His feet to embrace the Cross on which He hangs, and never again to move from His sight.

We come not here with fears. We come not trembling with anxiety how we shall be received. We come not because we are terrified by the thoughts of the wrath to come. Nay, these things we think not of at all. We come not because we find sin is unhappiness; if it was that which brought us to Jerusalem, it is not that which makes us hasten to Calvary. We come because love constraineth us, and we are drawn with the cords of a man.

We come not with high hopes, with thoughts of future usefulness, or of high rank and place among the children of God. We come not now with dreams of saintliness that we shall win by long and patient striving. We think not of fighting a noble battle, and of self-applause, and of a happy consciousness that God has been working in us. We come not in the strength of a firm will and a determined purpose. We cannot look at these things now. All these are good, but now we have no thoughts to spare for them. To be with Christ, the love of Christ, to be accepted as His, to be embraced by His arms, that is what we ask. There is nothing else in the whole world but He alone. We come to be with Him.

O Lord Jesu Christ, take us to Thyself, draw us with cords to the foot of Thy Cross; for we have not strength to come, and we know not the way. Thou art mighty to save, and none can separate us from Thy love. Bring us home to Thyself; for we are gone astray. We have wandered; do Thou seek us. Under the shadow of Thy Cross let us live all the rest of our lives, and there we shall be safe.¹

¹ *Sermons preached in Rugby School Chapel in 1858, 1859, 1860.* (Macmillan and Co., MDCCCLXI.)

EXETER MEMOIR

1869-1885

**By The Venerable E. G. SANDFORD, M.A., Archdeacon of
Exeter, Canon of Exeter**



THE TOWER OF THE CATHEDRAL, CHAPTER HOUSE, AND BISHOP'S PALACE, EXETER

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY—THE DIOCESE OF EXETER

Foundation of the See—Bishop Temple's early predecessors—
Reformation—Eighteenth century—Nineteenth century.

IN commemoration of Bishop Temple, Grandisson's great west window in Exeter Cathedral has been filled with stained glass. Of all the successors of the prelate of the Middle Ages, Frederick Temple is the one who most closely resembles him in force of character and strenuousness of life. But the stained glass window, as it now stands, carries back the thoughts to yet earlier days. The memorial is a bishops' window, and the figures in the lights span the eight centuries during which Bishops of Exeter presided over Devon and Cornwall as one united diocese. In Leofric and Temple we see the first and last of the line; there is unity and completeness. It is well that Frederick Temple should be gathered into this fellowship. A great personality, he was also a great bishop, counting it high privilege to hold the office, having his own full conception of the meaning of its duties; and from the day of his consecration giving himself wholly to it, making full proof of his ministry. And he was emphatically in his place as Bishop of Exeter. It was not only that his heart was in the West. Devonian and Cornish to the core, he felt that in

coming to Exeter he was coming to his own. On that account, when the Prime Minister gave him his choice of more than one Episcopal See, he chose Exeter; and quite late in life he expressed a doubt as to whether he had ever done right to leave it. But more than this—he had one special characteristic which has marked the Bishops of Exeter. The ideal bishop stands for his people; he is merged in their life; he lives in them, and they live in him. To this ideal the Bishops of Exeter have in large measure been true. They have been identified with the people of their diocese, and, as their representatives, have reflected, and some of them inspired the life of their times. It will quickly be seen, by reference to the history of the Exeter See, that in this respect they form a fitting spiritual ancestry for Bishop Temple.

Amongst the archives of the Cathedral is its Charter, given to it by Edward the Confessor in 1050, the year in which Leofric was enthroned:—

... I, Eadweard, King, with my hand do place this Charter (*privilegium*) upon the altar of St. Peter; and leading the prelate, Leofric, by his right arm, and my Queen, Eadgytha, also leading him by his left, I do place him in the Episcopal Throne (*cathedrâ*), in the presence of my lords and noble relations, and my chaplains; with the affirmation and approval of the Archbishops, Eadsine and Ælfric, with the rest whose names will be written out (*describentur*) at the end (*meta*) of this Charter.¹

Archdeacon Freeman adds in his well-known work:—

The signatures attesting the charter are of unique and wonderful interest. Those slightly undulating vertical lines of dots mark the places where, 823 years ago, the most famous men of the realm—some of whom, too, have left an indelible mark on the world's history—put their hands, not always very steadily, to a grant of no common significance. The

¹ Archdeacon Freeman's *History of Exeter Cathedral*, pp. 109-111.

Confessor himself and his two Archbishops—Earl Godwin—Earl Harold, his son, afterwards King of the English, who fell, axe in hand, at Hastings fighting for his crown—and Tostig, his rebel brother—are among the number.¹

The words of the charter call up before us the scene of the Installation, and a perpetual memory of it lives in the carved heads of the three principal actors which are inserted in the canopied sedilia of the sacrum in Exeter Cathedral. The rudely carved representation of the Confessor, with his Queen and his bishop, is in striking contrast with the graceful work of Bishop Stapeldon, and is probably of earlier date : it carries back the thoughts of the present occupants of the stalls to the first fathers of their race.

The words of Leofric's charter and the charter itself show that he understood the need of security for life and property, which was one of the chief requirements of early times.² That he was also in sympathy with another characteristic of his age, is evident from another memorial of his Episcopate, the constitution of the Cathedral Chapter. Like his royal master, he would be instinct with Norman ideas and with that love of discipline and order which was one of them. The monks at Exeter were transplanted to the new royal foundation at Westminster, and made way for a chapter of secular clergy, modelled on the rule of S. Chrodegang of Metz, a prelate of the eighth century. In the college of twenty-four canons—with the corresponding number of vicars³—

¹ Archdeacon Freeman's *History of Exeter Cathedral*, p. 109.

² Edward "makes over the Diocese of Cornwall to the See of Exeter, so that there may be one Episcopal seat"; and this "on account of the fewness and wasted condition of goods and persons there : the pirates having been able to devastate the churches of Cornwall and Crediton ; wherefore it seemed good to provide better safeguard against enemies in the city of Exeter."

³ It was not until the Episcopate of Bishop Stafford, in the reign of Henry IV. (1405), that the vicars were incorporated into a separate college of their own.

sharing a common table and made responsible for the daily services of the Cathedral, we have the germs of an institution which, under altered conditions, continues to this day. A like foundation was established in most of the English Cathedrals. The first prelate of the united See left good traditions for his successors to follow : he was a man of his time and understood its special wants.

In the generations which immediately followed, the Church-building epoch began ; it was the outcome of a greater sense of security, and in the first development the idea of security still had a place. Our first bishops were church-builders. They were also, for the most part, Normans, and as Professor Freeman has remarked—the first idea of a Norman was to build a castle. It is exemplified by the strong and massive towers of the Cathedral which took the place of some simpler structure of Leofric's time. The new Cathedral was some hundred years in building. The body of the building has since been transformed ; but the towers raised by Bishop Warelwast, nephew of the Conqueror, still stand in a massive strength which seems to speak security to friends and to frown defiance on foes.

But it is in the thirteenth century that the Middle Ages reach their highest level in art, politics, and mental development. It is the century when something of the artist was to be seen in every builder ; it is the century amongst statesmen of Simon de Montfort and his royal rival, but pupil, the first Edward ; it is the century in which modern science had its origin in the precocious intellect of Roger Bacon, and when literature stands crowned in the supreme genius of the Florentine poet. It is an age of marvellous fecundity and great beginnings ; some of them may

appear to be before their time, but was it not rather that, as with all that is best, growth came tardily; the conceptions were as seed sown in the ground, to spring up after long winter hours?

The age is nobly represented in the Exeter Episcopate.

Pre-eminent, above the rest, stand Bronescombe, Quivil, and Stapeldon. The last of these belongs strictly to the next century; but, in the richness of his full capacity, he claims affinity with the thirteenth. This century is emphatically the age of Gothic Architecture, the leading principle of which is, according to Coleridge, "Infinity made imaginable."¹ It was then at its purest and its best. In its pointed arches, its "slender shafts of shapely stone," the spire "whose silent finger points to heaven," it minded men, still enslaved by violence, but struggling to be free, of a better choice. It aided creation in the throes of a new birth; that which in "every part seemed to breathe with lofty aspirations" helped men to rise. Bronescombe did most for the movement in the parish churches of the diocese, and Quivil found expression for it in his noble conception of the Cathedral of Exeter. Perhaps it is in Bronescombe that we see the heavenly and spiritual aspirations of the century most beautifully expressed. He was consecrated about the middle of the century, and the grace of his consecration seemed, in a special sense, to rest upon his whole Episcopate of more than twenty years. His Itinerary shows that his travelling powers were wonderful, and they were largely spent in the dedication of new churches.² A wave of church-building revival was passing over the diocese, and in the space of nine years he dedicated eighty-eight rebuilt or enlarged churches.

¹ Bishop Lightfoot's *Historical Essays*, pp. 140-150.

² Bronescombe's *Episcopal Register* (Hingeston-Randolph), p. xii.

The inspiration of his character was breathed into the Cathedral, and became a legacy for his successor. Bronescombe remodelled or rebuilt the chapels of S. Mary Magdalene and S. Gabriel, and instituted a special festival in honour of the latter, "of whose favour, the Divine clemency so willing it, we have often felt the benefit."¹ This chapel contains his tomb; the very lineaments of the sculptured face, as well as the inscription on the monument, speak eloquently of the piety of the man :—

Quot loca construxit? Pietatis quot bona fecit?
 Quam sanctam duxit vitam? vox dicere quæ scit.
 Laudibus immensis jubilet gens Exoniensis
 Et chorus et turbæ, quia natus in hâc fuit Urbe.
 Plus si scire velis, festum statuit Gabrielis,
 Gaudeat in cœlis igitur Pater iste fidelis.

Bronescombe was succeeded by Peter Quivil, a native of Exeter, the third in succession who had been raised to the throne of its Cathedral. To his genius is due the idea of the Cathedral in its present form, though not the complete execution. From his mind came the inspiration; and the rude slab which now lies on the floor of the Lady Chapel, from which his work began, and where he is buried, with the quaint legend inscribed on it, are not without significance; "Petra tegit Petrum: nihil officiat sibi tetrum." These words draw away the mind to the Temple which was his conception, and the thought of which is his best memorial.

As Bronescombe and Quivil illustrate the thirteenth century on the side of its aspiring art, so does Walter Stapeldon represent the spring and freshness of the political life of the times. Dean Church, with delicate insight, has beautifully said that while the Episcopacy is a divine

¹ Oliver's *Lives of the Bishops of Exeter*, p. 44.

ministry which serves that kingdom where space and time are not, and in its highest functions looks to things not seen, so also . . . it lives in "a larger atmosphere in which all alike live"; it speaks for "a *communis sensus* of simpler, more elementary, accepted truths."¹ Stapeldon embodies both characteristics. His thoughts, like those of his immediate predecessors, were with his Cathedral. It was he who equipped it with its stately episcopal throne, its shapely sedilia, and a rich silver altar.² He was also a great diocesan bishop; he rivals Bronescombe in his powers of getting about from place to place, and we hear of him, at his first ordination held at Crediton, ordaining more than a thousand candidates.³

But his outlook is wider than the diocese, and his interests are not confined to ecclesiastical functions. It was an educational epoch. In the thirteenth century the University life of Oxford and Cambridge received large developments, crowds flocking from all parts to attend them, and the sons of the well-born accepting in friendly communion as fellow-students the sons of dependants. The needs of these poorer members of the Universities led to the formation of colleges as accessories to the University system. To these, exhibitions were annexed for the benefit of the poorer students,⁴ and Bishop Stapeldon has gained for himself an undying reputation as the founder of Exeter College at Oxford; scholarships which bear his name are still tenable there. The kindly intention, and the prescient mind which animated his educational zeal, was also seen in the foundation of the

¹ *Pascal and other Sermons*, by Dean Church, p. 107.

² Archdeacon Freeman's *Exeter Cathedral*, p. 46.

³ Stapeldon's *Ep. R.* pp. xiv and 446. Allowance must be made for the number of minor orders, and for the fact that Ordinations may not have been held with great regularity.

⁴ Bishop Lightfoot's *Historical Essays*, pp. 155-165.

grammar school in his Cathedral city.¹ The bishop set an example which, three centuries later, was followed by the citizens of Exeter when they refounded the school. Three centuries again, and the mantle fell on his successor, Bishop Temple, to whom in the main must be ascribed the remodelled scheme under which Bishop Stapeldon's original foundation is now administered. Stapeldon is the first of the goodly line of educational bishops in the See of Exeter. He is also the greatest of the statesmen-bishops of Exeter—a notable example of that combination of the Middle Ages which, if it sometimes made it impossible for the bishop to “wait on the Lord without distraction,” and encouraged non-residence in the parochial clergy, yet did much to enlarge the mind, and to insure that the chief of the diocese was not simply a local functionary with provincial interests. He went everywhere on his royal master's service, being now in France and now in England; and he sacrificed life at last to his fidelity. It is not easy to make out the precise incidents which excited the Londoners against him, but it is probable that at the bottom lay his loyalty to two of the best principles which lived on from the thirteenth century, and emanated from the school of the First Edward, namely, the sovereignty of law and the unity of the kingdom. Stapeldon, it would seem, fell a victim to his determination that the citizens of the metropolis should be law-abiding, and that foreign favourites should not rule the realm.² To the skill and pertinacity of Prebendary Hingeston-Randolph the churchmen of Devon are indebted for the knowledge that Stapeldon's splendid altartomb in Exeter Cathedral is not a mere cenotaph,

¹ The project was Stapeldon's; the execution of it stands to the credit of Grandisson. Oliver's *Lives of the Bishops of Exeter*, p. 57; Grandisson's *Ep. R.* Pt. III. p. xxxv.

² Stapeldon's *Ep. R.* p. xxix.

but that it covers the actual remains of the man who stands at the head of the Exeter bishops of old time for the full richness of many-sided capacity.¹

In the days of this great trio, the Middle Ages show most of exuberant life, and in the generation which followed, most of magnificence. It was the age of Cressy and Poitiers, a day of great, if not the highest, ambitions, when an imperial idea seems to begin to take shape, and the very form which it assumes shows some of the dangers which wait upon it. Bishop Lightfoot speaks of the "hollow parade" of the fourteenth century, and certainly the age of chivalry had its darker side of oppression and bloodshed. On the side of its splendour, John de Grandisson, the next bishop but one to Stapeldon, fitly represented it. An air of magnificence surrounds him. He is of noble birth; he receives his education at the celebrated University of Paris; he is a Pope's Chaplain, and a Pope's nominee, owing his elevation to the Bishopric of Exeter, in the first instance, to the *provision* of John XXII. The man corresponds with his surroundings; he is cast in a large mould, with a strong will and great ideas; he ranks himself and his office high; "worthy of great things," he thinks himself worthy of them.

But it is a greatness of soul which is under self-restraint. It was a far cry to Devonshire and Cornwall in those days, and in writing to the Pope he gives him an account of his first impressions of the latter country and its surroundings. He describes it "as a foreign land, adjoining England only along its Eastern boundary, being surrounded on every other side by the sea, which divides it from Wales and Ireland on the North. On the South, he adds, it looks towards Gascony and

¹ Stapeldon's *Ep. R.* p. xxxii.

Britanny ; and the Cornish speak the language of those Lands. In the far West, beyond S. Michael's Mount, it overlooks the boundless expanse of the Ocean. His diocese, he found, included a group of islands—the Scilly Isles—on which his Predecessors had never set foot, contenting themselves with sending certain Brothers thither, to look after the islanders, but he had not himself, as yet, done even so much as that.”¹ He writes, “at the same time, to certain Cardinals, his friends, telling them that, on account of his isolated position, they” will “probably hear little of him, or he of them, for a long time to come.”

I am not only set down (he tells them) in the ends of the earth, but in the very end of the ends thereof. My diocese, which embraces Devon and Cornwall, is separated from all the rest of England, and, except on one side only, surrounded by seas so tempestuous that they can scarcely be called navigable. The people of Cornwall speak in a tongue which is unknown to the English, and only known to Bretons . . . there is scarcely any corn in the County, or anything else for the use of mortals.

To another Cardinal, his friend, he writes more hopefully. “He was well and happy; for there was at least this comfort in his isolation, that he was far removed from the pressure of the populace; and, if he was unable to take his place among the Nobles of the Land, he was, at any rate, free from their incursions, and could not be shaken by the storms of life; he was spending his days, as it were, in the bosom of Abraham.”² Grandisson was thus far from life. But for all this he keeps himself strictly to his own diocese, and though conscious of capacity for taking the wider outlook, he is eminently a diocesan bishop, rarely leaving Devon or Cornwall during the longest Episcopate

¹ Bishop Temple visited these islands in the summers of 1871 and 1875.

² Grandisson's *Ep. R.* Pt. III. pp. xix, xx.

(forty-three years) of any prelate of the united See. And while in the diocese, he is emphatically its bishop, and his first care is his Cathedral. Quivā had given the designs for the nave, and had at least completed the eastern bay: it suited Grandisson's large views to carry out the whole conception. The greatness, and the very style of the west window, which crowns and dominates the whole building, in its bold outline speaks the man. Whether or not the conjecture be correct that the Minstrels' Gallery was first used at the reception in Exeter of the captive King John of France, on his way from Plymouth to London,¹ the stateliness of the structure, with its elaboration of ornament, points naturally to the same magnificent mind for its origin.

The foundation of the College of S. Mary, Ottery, was the bishop's companion work to his labour on the Cathedral. It had its origin in the purchase of the manor of Ottery from the Chapter of Rouen.² Its constitution shared Grandisson's time and thought with the ordering of the Cathedral of the diocese; and, though the character of the remodelled and enlarged Church at Ottery is simple and more severe—an adaptation, it is said, of an earlier style—yet its twin towers and general stateliness give it a close resemblance to the mother church. Grandisson makes himself felt in the government, no less than in the fabric of the Cathedral. The Dean and Chapter may question, but they obey: if otherwise, the Dean himself is excommunicated.³ From the head of the Cathedral body down to the individual choirman, all feel his hand. The behaviour of the choir, the condition of the service-books, each detail in turn, receive his attention.

¹ Archdeacon Freeman's *Exeter Cathedral*, p. 79.

² Grandisson's *Ep. R.* Pt. III. p. xlvi.

³ *Ibid.* Pt. III. p. xxxvi.

His *Legenda* and *Ordinale* survive to this day amongst the treasures of the Chapter,¹ as enduring records of the bishop's detailed concern for the order and dignity of the Cathedral worship. Still in the sonorous tones of the great tenor bell, called after him, and, may be, the gift of his munificence, which peals over the city and country, and leaves its echoes on the ear when the vibrations of its sisters in the belfry have ceased, the power of the mediæval bishop's grand personality still seems to live. His hand was felt by lay magnates as well as by Cathedral dignitaries, and all are brought to their knees at last. Not even from a Courtenay will he brook any censure: thus closes his contention with the Lord of Okehampton, who had ventured to criticise his conduct: "He had been brought up in the School of Clerks and Prelates, and he did not see his way to go to school again elsewhere: how could a Prelate be expected to go to school to a Knight, when S. Paul had said that 'he that is spiritual judgeth all things, and he himself is judged of no man!'"² The bishop's interpretation of the New Testament is open to question; there is no mistake about his claim to sit in judgment on his lay cousin. Even to the king he scarce bows his head, and when summoned to account for resisting the action of certain Royal Commissioners, he makes good his case in his Provincial Court.³

As long as Grandisson was in his diocese he would brook no ecclesiastical rival. The story of his armed resistance to the entry of the Archbishop, when the Metropolitan desired to include Exeter in his provincial visitation, is well known:—

Nequiter vi armatâ per Johannem de Grandissono Episcopum Exoniensem, ne visitationem hujusmodi impenderet, sicut ad officium suum pertinuit (impeditus fuit): sicque

¹ Grandisson's *Ep. R.* Pt. III. p. lxxvi, note.

² *Ibid.* Pt. III. pp. xv, xvi.

³ *Ibid.* Pt. III. p. lvi.

archiepiscopus ille, litteris regiis et aliis turbationibus illicitis, de dictâ recedere diœcesi, infecto hujus visitationis negotio, est compulsus.¹

Less familiar perhaps is the account of the stately courtesy he extended when he believed that no encroachment was being made by the visitor on his prerogatives. Few more imposing ceremonies, even under the stately *régime* of Grandisson, were seen than when Richard Fitz-Ralph was consecrated Archbishop of Armagh in the Cathedral, and rode afterwards in great procession of knights, citizens, and clergy through Exeter. All this magnificence suited the temper of the age, and rather enhanced than otherwise Grandisson's claim to stand for the people of his diocese. The position of the bishops of the Middle Ages; as recognised champions of the liberties of the people and their friends against the oppression of the King and nobles, was specially illustrated in the case of all the Bishops of Exeter. The episcopal registers make it plain that, in spite of much occupation with the King's business, they were much in their own diocese. When not "on visitation," or engaged with other episcopal functions, they would be living in the Cathedral City, or resident on one or other of their numerous episcopal manors. As landowners they were brought into daily touch with the life of the people; they educated the poor; they bettered the condition of the dependants on their estates; they were ready helpers in times of need. The life of the city and county was the bishop's life in a fuller sense than could be said of any other man. And this characteristic especially held in the case of Grandisson. The man was great, but in his greatness the whole diocese shared. It sat with him on his bishop's

¹ Birchington's *Life of Simon Mepham* ("Angl. Sac." vol. i. p. 18). Referred to by Oliver, pp. 81, 82.

throne ; he covered it under the shadow of his own wide influence. When he contended, he contended not for himself but for his people ; in his greatness they were great, and under it they were safe.

In sad contrast with the splendour of the episcopate is the gloom in which it closed. The quick succession in which notices of institutions and inductions in the same parish occur in the Diocesan Register is in itself a graphic picture of the devastation that was wrought by the plague of the Black Death. These records bear eloquent, though simple, witness to the fidelity with which the parochial clergy tended their people during the visitation.¹ The ordinary annual average of institutions in the diocese was 36 ; but in no more than seven months of the year 1349, when the plague was at its height, the institutions amounted to 264 ; and “these figures, appalling as they are, do not represent all the deaths that occurred amongst the beneficed clergy,” as many died for whom at the time no successor could be found.² It has been calculated that “the total death-roll in the clerical order throughout the land was some 25,000.”³ Bishop Grandisson remained at his post throughout the visitation. Foreign war was joined to pestilence at home, and these, in combination with the social strife of the times, give a sombre close to this age of magnificence.

The glory of the Middle Ages was on the wane at the close of the fourteenth century ; and a new age with a new spirit and new movement was beginning to dawn. The Diocese of Exeter had a full interest in the religious crisis which followed ; but the work of the Church was done by different methods. The line of great ecclesiastics fails with Grandisson, and during the Reformation epoch

¹ Grandisson's *Ep. R.* Pt. III. p. lxxv.

² *Ibid.* Pt. III. p. lxxvi.

³ *Ibid.* Pt. III. p. lxxvii.

and the settlement of the Anglican Church under the new conditions, the centre of interest seems to shift from men to movement. It is true that both among the bishops and other churchmen of the west there were men of mark. It is a glory to Exeter that she reckons Miles Coverdale, the translator of the Bible, amongst her bishops. Seth Ward (1662-67) was a prelate who could build the old waste places, and bring back order and good administration. Trelawny (1688-1707), in facing the wrath of a king, showed even more than the courage with which his great predecessor Grandisson met oppression and high-handed dealing. Ofspring Blackall (1707-16) exemplified on humbler levels, and with much graciousness of spirit, if not with equal power, the educational zeal of Stapeldon. Jewel and Richard Hooker, though not Bishops of Exeter, were both of them Devonshire men, and stand in the foremost rank, the one for his controversial, and the other for his constructive ability. They were "pillars" of the Church of God, but they were great thinkers rather than great leaders of men. The leaders of England in these centuries were not all amongst "the saints" (far from it), and few of them were ecclesiastics. Amongst the latter were good men, worthy of remembrance; but for the most part they did not inspire. The Reformation struggle in England was a soldiers' battle; it was won not by the commanding genius of the few, but by the faithfulness of the many—it was won because "the common people" were ready to die for their cause.

And though the dearth of leaders may have saved the English Church from subjection to a heresiarch, and from fatal aberrations from the faith, it was a loss. The bishops, for the most part, reflected only; they did not originate; and by that process of gradual deterioration which results from

abandoning the higher aims, sometimes they came to reflect, not the intrinsically best, but the current and the conventional. In an age of non-residence, they were non-resident; in an age when social and political considerations were the chief consideration, they "*just conformed*." They were often chosen not because they were eminent for piety or mental power, but because their family was good, their opinions were safe and free from all taint of "*enthusiasm*"; it was thought that they would do no harm—and in this sense they appeared to justify their appointment. But did no harm come? The absence of higher spirituality in the leaders produced a lower level amongst the main body of the clergy; and this pulled down the general standard of moral life amongst the people. Neither amongst clergy nor laity were notorious criminals commonly met with, and the violence and oppression of the Middle Ages did not come back. On the contrary, benevolence was a special characteristic of the eighteenth century. But the Church did not help men to rise heavenward; some, in consequence, sank to the lowest depths; and in all there was a secret sense that the spiritual element was not developed and that the soul was not fed. The Church missed a great opportunity, and when the leader at last came, he was found, it is true, in the ranks of the English clergy, but not amongst its bishops. Nor did the bishops extend to him that inspiring and sustaining support which might have kept John Wesley and his followers loyal to the Church of England. Bishop Lavington is styled on his monument in Exeter Cathedral, "a successful Exposer of Pretence and Enthusiasm," and, true to this character, he speaks out in no measured language against the Methodists—"a people of sanctified singularities; low fooleries, and high pretensions," he calls them.¹

¹ Tyerman's *Life and Times of John Wesley*, vol. ii. p. 91.

Bishop Ross, with gentler spirit and some approach to appreciation, could be kind and hospitable. Wesley "dined on the Sunday with the Bishop in his Palace, five other clergymen and four of the aldermen of Exeter being present besides himself."¹ But the spirit of Wesley's movement could not live without a full measure of positive fellowship, and failing to receive this, it drifted away from the Church.

And yet the Devonshire temperament, though it is slow to apprehend, is not irreceptive, and what it has received, it retains. The love of the Exeter citizens for their Cathedral still shows an influence imparted in the thirteenth century by its founders. There is still an educational zeal in the city, which might be traced back through Blackall and Oldham to Stapeldon. The men of Devon opposed the Reformation in the sixteenth century, but the memories of the Armada show that they had caught the fulness of its spirit before that century closed. Wesley was met with open violence,² or with the indifference which he feared more,³ when he first entered Devon and Cornwall; but the crowds which throng the yearly gathering at Gwennap Pit, and the chapels which stud the roadsides, tell a different tale now. "The south of England will follow its leaders," once said Dr. Temple, all unconsciously.

But both in Church and State it must recognise the moral claim of the men who aspire to lead. After the Reformation the ecclesiastic could not be recalled, nor the system of which he was the embodiment. Mediævalism had run its appointed course, and, even if successors had been found worthy of Grandisson, they would not have held his sway. Mediævalism rested on external

¹ Tyerman's *Life and Times of John Wesley*, vol. iii. p. 384.

² *Ibid.* vol. i. pp. 470-473.

³ *Ibid.* vol. i. p. 419.

authority, and that *régime* belonged to the past. It had died hard. In Devon it never shone with more splendid light than under Grandisson, the last of the line of great ecclesiastical leaders. In England it had never been more dominant than under the Tudor dynasty. But in the throes of great political and religious revolutions, England was new-born; at least she would lead her life under new conditions. Restatement of doctrine had been rendered necessary, and the change necessitated corresponding changes in ritual: practical abuses of system had been reformed: and behind and beneath all had been the change in the representative of Divine authority. It was now recognised that the throne was occupied, not by an external Church, but by the Divine Spirit Himself, using the Church, but using also the individual conscience, and in the last resort making that the highest court of appeal. Was it not here that Dr. Temple's immediate predecessor was at fault? Bishop Phillpotts had many of the qualities of a leader, subtilty and incisiveness of thought, a strong will, great courage and pertinacity. His ideal of the Church, and his standard of clerical life, were high. He had the power of rule; he kept his diocese in order; but he lived too late. He was right in standing by the old principles, but he did not rightly apply them to present needs; sympathy with modern spirit and method was wanting. This was illustrated by his conduct in the matter of the Diocesan Synod. In calling it together, his instinct was right; he could clearly see that the best defence of the Church would be found in the revival of synodical action, because it would enlarge the number of defenders. His instinct was at fault in regard to the special object for which the Synod was summoned; for he summoned it, not for the

enlarging of service, but for the narrowing of liberty. His whole attitude throughout the Gorham controversy was courageous; but had it not been decided in the Courts that the Church of England was wide enough to comprehend both his view and that of his opponent, the Church would have been not stronger but weaker. There was a narrowness in the *régime* which did not draw the whole body of Churchmen: he had devoted adherents, but not the whole diocese at his back. Few generous men will deny the conscientiousness of his conduct and the elevation of his aim, and he is entitled to the lasting gratitude of Churchmen of all schools for preventing the body ecclesiastical from falling asunder in times of laxity and conflict, and for lifting the level of Church life. But the lead was not large or full enough for the ancient Church in the modern world; above all, the system rested overmuch on external authority: it was an effort to rehabilitate the Church in an old vesture, and to place her power not in influence but edict.

But if ecclesiasticism was dead, neither could individualism give the lead. The Evangelical party had done much throughout England to quicken spiritual life in the individual and to raise the standard of morality in society. There was, moreover, a warmth in the system which had some attraction for all, and which drew adherents into a very close fellowship. In the Exeter diocese the school was represented by good and earnest men; but they stood apart—partly because official favour did not light upon them, and partly because they drew a ring around themselves; in the spirit, not new to the adherents of any school, they believed in intensity rather than in unity in diversity. They were only a section, though a most important section, of the Church of England, and it was impossible for a section to speak or act in the name

of the whole Church : they stood for what was individual ; they did not understand the meaning or the power of a Church Corporate.

What, then, was the lead needed ? One which had affinities both with the old and new ; one which, with the historic sense which appreciates the past, would blend the spirit which was stirring in modern life ; one which would give whole-hearted acceptance both to the idea of the Church and the teaching of the Bible, though not as the expressions of an external authority, but as the response to the requirements of a free spirit ; one which, while recognising the value of the individual unit, would recognise the oneness of the collective Body. A strong lead was needed, but its power must rest, not only on a dominant will, but still more on spiritual attraction. Perhaps there would be opposition when it came ; and much that was best in the diocese, because of past teachings and traditions, would be arrayed against it ; but formerly Devon had in the long - run caught inspirations and accepted a lead which at first had been rejected. It might be so again.

CHAPTER II

THE COMING OF DR. TEMPLE TO EXETER

Letters of congratulation—Opposition on account of *Essays and Reviews*—Correspondence—Election—Confirmation—Consecration—Enthronement—Statement in Convocation.

LONG before his ordination “prophecies went before on” Frederick Temple as to high place which he would one day hold in the ministry of the English Church; and during the Kneller Hall period a bishopric had been assigned to him by public rumour.¹ Since this time his work at Rugby had brought him more prominently into notice, and had established his reputation both for intellectual power and force of character. His line of thought in relation to Theology and the Church was not quite Mr. Gladstone’s, as is evident from his own early correspondence with his friends. The following estimate, written in 1854, is a remarkable illustration of Dr. Temple’s political prescience and insight into character :—

Gladstone is the man of the future. . . . For Gladstone will throw a vast amount of radicalism into the scale. . . .

His policy will be to set the Dissenters as free as possible. He will remove from them every kind of grievance real or fancied. He would even, if he could, buy up all the tithes and endow the Church entirely with land so as to make it a vast private corporation; and I am not sure that such an able financier might not succeed in doing so. . . .

¹ Editor’s Supplement, vol. ii. p. 584.

Then he would set the Church free; give her the control of her own members; revive her discipline; revive her Convocation, etc. etc. etc. . . .

That this would end in Americanism I have no doubt.

But I believe the true *spiritual* hold of the Church to reside in her non-discipline. The Church is now the most tolerant of all denominations; but she owes this character to her bondage. When the bondage has lasted long enough to teach her toleration, she may be set free; but at present she needs "the schoolmaster." Until toleration is felt as a principle, the freedom of the body is the slavery of the members.

Ergo I fear Gladstone, much as I admire him.¹

The fundamental conceptions of the two men were different, and their views diverged increasingly as the Cavour ideal of a "Free Church in a Free State" gained firmer hold upon the great English statesman. But Mr. Gladstone, to whom Bishop Temple owed two of the three chief positions which he held in life, always recognised his claims. In the present instance they had specially been brought home to him by the eager and earnest part which Dr. Temple had lately taken on the question of the Disestablishment of the Irish Church. Moreover, Mr. Gladstone had heard him speak at Liverpool in 1865, and in a letter written to him two years later refers to his speech as one which he "cannot readily forget." Quite apart, however, from these considerations, Dr. Temple was a man who was bound to go to the front, whenever the opportunity of promoting him occurred to a statesman anxious to do his best in the interests of the Church. In the summer of 1869 the Premier offered him the Deanery of Durham. This he refused. The Deanery had its connexion with the University, but, as he states in a letter to Dr. Benson, no educational position could, while he was still in his vigour, draw him from Rugby.

¹ Scott Correspondence.

Christ Church and Durham had attractions, but "no other Deanery for me till I am well past sixty." In the autumn, however, of the same year four English bishoprics became vacant, or were on the point of being vacated—Oxford, Bath and Wells, Exeter, and Manchester. The Prime Minister gave him his choice.¹ Dr. Temple's educational experience and general habit of thought gave him special affinities with the kind of work offered at the University or the industrial centre; but his West Country attachments prevailed: "They know me, and I know them"; and he chose Exeter.

As soon as the news became known letters of congratulation began to flow in. It is interesting for us, standing off from the event at a distance of more than thirty years, to recall some who helped to make the life of their time, and to note their different attitudes towards what was then taking place. In not a few cases personal friendship for the chief figure gives a touch which increases the interest. Three primacies seem here to meet. Two archbishops send greeting to a third. Tait, who had helped the beginnings of the rise in Balliol days, writes to his old pupil:—

October 7, 1869.

MY DEAR TEMPLE—Mr. Gladstone tells me to-day for certain of your appointment to Exeter. Though I felt sure it would be so, I (from past experience) dared not write to you till I was officially assured that the arrangement was settled.

I trust that God's best blessings may rest upon you. You have before you a great work, and at this time especially

¹ "When the time came that I was honoured with the bishopric by the Government, and was asked to choose which of the bishoprics then vacant I should prefer to accept, I preferred to go to Exeter because of my strong affection for the place and for the people." (Speech in the Guildhall, Exeter, 1897, see *infra*, p. 609).

I expect that your independence and energy will be of the greatest value . . . —Ever sincerely yours,

A. C. CANTUAR.

Benson expresses a loyalty which is at once divided, and yet whole-hearted :—

October 7, 1869.

MY DEAR TEMPLE—Oh! how I hope and trust that the “authority” *is* good. I don’t like to see (as at Rugby, I do) the sharp edges of the sword coming through the sheath, and at Exeter the scabbard may be mended,—even while you do the work which for the Church’s sake wants doing most.

It will be like praying for the North and South Pole—and make me a true Catholic for ever, to have in my daily prayers “Christopher, Bishop of Lincoln, and Frederick, Bishop of Exeter,” as “in private duty bound.” We are one—in hope—and in love—Your affectionate, F. W. B. & Co.

Dr. Harold Browne, then Bishop of Ely, is specially conscious of the debt that he owes Dr. Temple for the training of his sons at Rugby :—

I see it announced that you are to be a bishop of a diocese very dear to me, from seventeen years’ intimate connexion with it, and from its being my wife’s native home.

I write at once to offer you my best wishes and felicitations; perhaps I should rather say sympathy. Probably there are many points in which you and I see differently. You would not think the better of me if I affected to be ignorant of them. I do not think you will accuse me of a very narrow spirit, or a readiness to magnify such differences. At all events, I have always felt and expressed very true respect for you as a high-minded, conscientious, religious man. I am deeply indebted to you for all you have done for my four sons, whom I have committed to your guardianship; and I pray, as I hope, that you will be strengthened and guided by the Spirit of God to be a wise, pious, and faithful Chief Pastor of His Church.

Bishop Wilberforce’s memory takes him back to the times of Dr. Temple’s ordination with the high hopes of his future career which he then formed :—

I see in the *Guardian* the announcement of your appointment to the See of Exeter, and I cannot forbear writing one line in the remembrance of the past and the hopes of the future to reach out a brotherly hand to you. I can never forget the times of your ordination, or my brother Robert's loving regard for you. Often and often in my poor way I have defended you from what seem utter misconceptions of your character, and whilst I suppose there are matters on which we differ, I cannot forbear saying that I do firmly believe we shall not only sympathise with one another but work often together. I need hardly say that my personal feelings of old regard are strongly quickened, and that if in any way I can help you, command me.

Dean Stanley welcomes the personal friend, and as he hoped, the Liberal ally :—

October 6, 1869.

If you have not received the official intimation that you are to be Bishop of Exeter, do not disclose it from this letter, but forgive me for being unable to suppress my extreme joy at the fulfilment of my long-cherished desire. *Nunc dimittis servum tuum.* . . . But my object in writing is to be the first and foremost to wish you and myself joy of an event which I do truly believe may yet be the salvation of the Church of England.

Tom Hughes rejoices in the thought of a *strong* bishop :—

October 9, 1869.

One line to tell you how glad I am of your bishopric, which a line from Glyn assures me of this morning. I had not believed the rumour before.

I only hope Gladstone will have the courage to promote *strong* men of all the schools, else I doubt how the Church will hold together much longer.

Dr. Bradby, Headmaster of Haileybury, gives a well-timed but little-heeded caution against overwork.

HAILEYBURY, October 11, 1869.

I hear you are really going to the Bishopric of Exeter, and I will make bold to express my satisfaction to you. .

We have enough of Liberalism without Piety, and Piety

without Liberalism in the world. If we get the two combined, as they should be, in one man, and he is put in high place, then there is hope of good.

May I venture my mite of advice? Don't work yourself to death. I can't see the use, or reverence, or propriety of a man's insisting on cramming a week's work into four days. As though God's purposes could not be effected unless he overstrained himself.

It will be some consolation to you in leaving Rugby that you are going to shepherd your own county.

Don't reply. If you do, I shall be almost certain that I have bored you. Now I can wish you God-speed with a light heart.

Mr. Bryce is glad in the interests of culture and of University Reform :—

October 18, 1869.

Will you let me express to you the delight with which so many of us here at Oxford have heard of the appointment to Exeter? It is not merely for the sake of the Church that we are glad; but here at Oxford when the University Reform questions come on again we feel how much there will be that you can effect for putting things on a new and better footing.¹

The letter from Matthew Arnold has special interest on personal grounds, and as coming from the son of Dr. Temple's great predecessor.

HARROW, October 12, 1869.

I have often thought of you in the last few days, and must write you one word to say how I rejoice in your move. I had rather you had gone to Oxford, but the great matter is that you should hold the post somewhere. The times, in spite of all people say, are good and will be better; in the seventeenth century I should certainly have been in orders, and I think, if I were a young man now, I would take them.

¹ This letter produced the following reply, "characteristic in its brief vigour."

RUGBY, October 21, 1869.

MY DEAR BRYCE—Thank you. I mean to help the University if I can. But meanwhile what a noise there is in the West. I wonder whether I shall be able to hear my own voice down there.—Yours ever,
F. TEMPLE.

The future of the Church of England entirely depends upon itself; I do believe, instead of passing away into a voluntary sect, it may become far greater and more national than it has ever yet been; few can do more for such a desirable consummation than you can, and therefore I so heartily rejoice in your appointment.

Once more, my dear Temple, my best and heartiest wishes.

Finally, the aged Lord Russell, lately Prime Minister, and formerly Dr. Temple's chief at the Education Office, writes characteristically:—

November 26, 1869.

I have been too much rejoiced at your nomination by the Crown, and election by the Chapter as Bishop of Exeter, to refrain altogether from expressing to you my satisfaction, congratulation is not the word, for the endeavour to promote truth by discussion; to instil the spirit of Christ into those who profess to teach religion, is still a struggle and a combat where those who engage cannot expect to escape without a wound. . . .

But the appointment was not to go unchallenged. All the influences which had been in operation upon Temple's mind from the day of his leaving school had tended to emancipate it from external control, and to give play to its own vigorous working. The atmosphere of the University, full-charged with the cross currents of controversy, had stirred him intellectually into full activity, and the chief ecclesiastical movement of his time, although it had been directed against Liberalism, working upon an alert mind like his, had not confined but enlarged thought. The intellectual and cultured friends, the Education Office, and finally Rugby calling out the response of a sympathetic nature to the eagerness of young minds, whether those of masters or of elder pupils, all told in the same direction; and the result was that Dr. Temple had gained the reputation, even more than he merited, of being an

advanced Liberal both in politics and theology. Temple through life paid the penalty which always waits upon special fulness and largeness of mind. The real fact was that he did not part with the old in adopting the new, and that much of the Conservative view kept its place in him alongside of the Liberal. It was the seat of authority which had been changed, far more than the subject-matter of belief. But this was never understood, except by those who thoroughly knew him; and in the present instance the fact that he had been a contributor to the notorious *Essays and Reviews* was taken as sufficient proof of the sort of man he was.

Events have moved quickly in the ecclesiastical as well as in the political sphere during the last forty years, and it is not easy for younger men to understand the stir caused in the religious world by this volume. The chief objection to the book as a whole was its negative character, but charges of heresy are not rightly based on absence of affirmation; and it would be impossible that Convocation should now solemnly condemn such a volume. As a matter of fact, the substance of the Essay in question had been given as a sermon, first in the school chapel at Rugby, and afterwards, in a more elaborate form, before the University of Oxford, without provoking much adverse comment. If the Essay had been written later it would have been free from some unguarded expressions; but it was a clear expression of positive faith from a liberal standpoint, and if read now it would be regarded as making strongly for the defence of revealed truth. It appears, however, that the Prime Minister, with his finger on the pulse of Church and nation, had fully gauged the probability of an outburst of opposition; and in this case the more credit is due for the courage shown in making the appointment.

The storm quickly broke. The protagonist, Dr. Pusey, at once writes protesting against "the horrible scandal of the recommendation of the editor of the *Essays and Reviews* to be a Christian bishop." It was soon known that Dr. Temple, so far from being the editor, had not even seen the other Essays till they were published, and that he did not know who was the editor until he wrote to ask him for his paper. But whether he was the editor or not, he had allowed his Essay to remain in what was, in Dr. Pusey's estimate, "a soul-destroying book." Other well-known leaders, Deans Mansell and Burgon, the great combatant Arch-deacon Denison, thunder forth. High and Low Church join forces. The following advertisement is issued from a committee room in Cockspur Street :—

The Earl of Shaftesbury and the Rev. Dr. Pusey having consented to act in unison in using every effort to prevent the scandal to the Church caused by the Premier's nomination of Dr. Temple, clergymen and laymen willing to support their brethren in the Diocese of Exeter are requested to communicate without delay with the secretaries.

The beacon fires once lighted spread from hill to hill. The Church newspapers are ready messengers; each post publishes a new letter and brings an additional protest; each day has its new revelation, which the following day discredits, of the complicity of the bishop-nominate in plots against the orthodoxy of the Church. The infection spreads to the threatened diocese; two counties and the whole city of Exeter—Cathedral Chapter and parochial clergy alike—are in an uproar. From the rural deaneries, both in the town and country districts, memorials of protest flow in. Some of the first supporters become uneasy about their previous letters of congratulation. Bishop Harold Browne writes under date October 18, 1869 :—

MY DEAR DR. TEMPLE—You have pardoned me already for saying that we have probably differences of opinion. I left my boys under your care, and my late revered friend Bishop Phillpotts told me that he consented that his grandson should become a master under you, because your character stood so high in all that was honourable and disinterested, and because you had infused such a high moral tone into your school.

I, in common with many who so respected you, regretted deeply that you wrote in a well-known volume, though each writer in that volume claimed limited liability. . . . There is now a great agitation about your nomination by the Crown to the See of Exeter. I have no business with the question. But I am deeply interested in Exeter. I have valued friends in the Chapter. I have a great personal regard for yourself. Is there anything unreasonable in a bishop designate being asked to profess his faith for the satisfaction of those who are to elect him, and who will be sworn to elect according to their consciences? Bishops in olden times entering on their dioceses often made some profession of faith.

You will not like to do so in answer to clamour. That I quite appreciate. But I am no claimourer, and I am a common friend of yourself and the Chapter. Would there be anything out of place in your telling me, so that I might tell others, that you not only hold all the Articles of the Catholic Creeds, but that you believe and trust in the Atoning Sacrifice offered on the Cross, and that you do not doubt the special and supernatural inspiration of the Prophets and Apostles, not placing that inspiration on the level of genius, and so considering S. Paul as only so inspired as was Cicero and Shakespeare? I do not wish to put words into your mouth. I may be very presumptuous; but my presumption arises from an anxious desire to save the Church from another disastrous struggle, and to preserve, if it be possible, both its purity and its peace.

Later on Bishop Wilberforce, who had now been translated to Winchester, takes alarm :—

FARNHAM CASTLE,
Dec. 20, 1869.

MY DEAR BISHOP—I write simply to explain what you say you are unable to understand in me.

The letter of mine to which you refer¹ was written on my first hearing of your nomination. It was the natural outcome of my own feelings to F. Temple. When I wrote it I did not even recall to mind that your Essay was included in any Censure of Convocation.

My feeling to *you* is now what it was when I wrote that letter.

My earnest desire that you should, for the Church's sake and that of others, and, I might almost say especially, for the sake of Gladstone, separate yourself from what Convocation has condemned, seems to me not only not difficult of reconciliation with this feeling towards you, but to be its necessary consequence.—I am, very truly yours,

S. WINTON.

Sir Stafford Northcote, who never forgot the past days in which he had sat with Temple at the Scholars' table in Balliol, writes a letter which must strongly have appealed to kindred feelings in his old college friend :—

October 17, 1869.

MY DEAR TEMPLE—I have hesitated for some time before I could make up my mind to write to you, but I think I may do so without being misunderstood. First, let me offer you my best wishes on your appointment to this diocese, in which I feel persuaded that you will do a great deal of good. Next, will you allow me to say that, having been in the way of hearing the opinions of a great number of persons, clerical and lay, and representing very various shades of thought, I have found a strong desire prevailing amongst them all, that you would take some opportunity of expressing yourself in language that would counteract the effect produced by your connexion with the *Essays and Reviews*. There are, of course, some extreme men whom nothing is likely to satisfy; but I speak of very moderate men, who hold language of this kind, "I have no doubt Dr. Temple will make a very excellent bishop; most probably within the next year or two I shall have to receive him in my house when he comes down to confirm at—; I wish I had some good reason for not joining in the opposition to his Election, which will place me in disagreeable relations with him; but as matters at present stand I have no option but

¹ *Supra*, p. 277.

to join. I regard the *Essays and Reviews* (as to some of them) as heterodox ; I find him associating himself with the Essayists, and though I have no objection to make to his own Essay, I am pained to find that he refuses to separate himself from his associates in the work ; how can I do otherwise than labour to prevent his election as my bishop ? ”

According to the best of my information I think your election will be carried in the Chapter, perhaps by a casting vote. Even if it were not, you would of course be gazetted by the authority of the Crown. But there would be a strong opposing party in the diocese, and it is not impossible that your appointment may give occasion for a secession of more or less importance ; and what the effect of a secession might be it is difficult to say.

Can you not, for the sake of, not only the diocese, but the Church, say something that would encourage your friends and confirm waverers ? . . .

But the object, whether of solicitation or attack, stands unmoved ; “*Si fractus illabatur orbis, Impavidum ferient ruinae.*” Not that the tender heart within the granite case did not feel ; his private letters speak of sleepless nights ; and the marks left on the strong face by the charge of disloyalty to his Master, and by the disquietude of his friends, were plain enough to one who met him on the eve of his Consecration. The pallor of the countenance and the set face told their own tale. But he always stood to the conviction that the widest possible latitude of opinion ought to be allowed within the boundaries of the English Church consistently with the acceptance of her formularies, and he would not repudiate such a limited association as was implied by writing in the same volume of *Essays*, unless the contributors were condemned by the recognised Courts of Law ; he believed that he was maintaining the cause of religious liberty, and that in doing this he was acting as a true Churchman. He also believed that loyalty to the cause of religious liberty required that he should make no other declaration at this

time than those required by the law of the Church.

RUGBY, *October 11, 1869.*

MY DEAR COLERIDGE—. . . I do not think I can rightly or wisely make any public declaration about *Essays and Reviews*.

If I speak at all, I must be just to the other writers, and I must be quite open to the Church.

Now I did not and do not consider myself responsible for the opinions of the other writers. I said so then. It was said in the Preface to the Book.

To say so again now would mean a great deal more. It would mean condemnation. I am not prepared to condemn them, though in not a few points I disagree with several of them.

Further, it would mean that I thought that the Book as a whole had done harm. I think it has done much good as well as harm, and that the good preponderates.

To break through the mischievous reticence which was crusting over the clergy and damaging the very life of the Church was worth purchasing at a high price. Many, perhaps most, will think the price too high. I cannot think so.

To say all this would certainly not stop any outcry. And less than this I fear that I cannot say, if I say anything. . . .

I am quite satisfied that when once I am among the clergy I can win many whom no honest declaration will win. Much mischief may perhaps be done meanwhile. But I know what I can do and what I cannot. I cannot prevent it, but I can repair it.—Yours very affectionately,

F. TEMPLE.

RUGBY, *October 16, 1869.*

MY DEAR COOK—I cannot well tell you how much I feel for all my friends in Exeter just now. And for you, who have not merely to talk but to act, how can I feel enough?

But I am afraid that it is quite impossible for me to help you.

To make any public statement or to answer any question appears to me to be quite inconsistent with my position. It would sanction a most dangerous precedent, sure to be imitated, and sure to have dangerous consequences.

Whatever you may think of it now, you may depend upon it, it would distinctly weaken me for my work. I should become a bishop more easily, but a damaged bishop.

But further, no statement that I could rightly make would disarm the opposition. If I say anything I must be full and open. A full and open statement would satisfy you. But it would be received with shrieks by — and his followers. I preached a sermon in Whitehall some little time ago (which Gladstone at the time sent for and read) to express my belief, *inter alia*, that the beginning of Genesis was a poem, to be interpreted as we interpret the Apocalypse or the last part of Ezekiel. You very likely would disagree with such a view. But you would not say that a man who held it was no Christian. Yet the chief leaders of all this agitation would say that this was as bad as anything.

Lastly, though I am unwilling to bring in personal considerations in such a case, yet it is inevitable. What can a bishop be worth who has no regard for personal character? It would seem to me so inconsistent with all personal self-respect to say one word about the other writers of *Essays and Reviews*, that I cannot imagine anything that would induce me to do it directly or indirectly: certainly not a bishopric. A right-minded man *cannot* enter on such an office by beginning with what lowers him before his own conscience.

I have written quite freely and unreservedly. But let me add that you may feel quite sure that if my letter and my refusal to help you hampers you so much that you judge it best to stand quite aside, I shall have no doubt at all that you have done right.

We differ, I daresay, not a little. But at any rate we have learnt too much respect for each other to allow either to doubt the conscientiousness of the other. Even if I am never Bishop of Exeter I shall still know that I have your friendship.

One report I have heard that you may perhaps come across and wish to meet, viz., that I was the editor of the Book. I was not the editor, as I think you know; and I never saw any Essay but my own till the Book was published. I should not like to be quoted as saying this just now. But still it is a bare fact which you may as well know.

Undated.

MY DEAR ARCHDEACON (Freeman)—I have to acknowledge your letter of the 20th. It must be a matter of regret when-

ever pain or doubt or want of cordiality affects the relations between the clergy and the bishop. No diocese can fail to suffer if there be any degree of disagreement between those who ought to co-operate so entirely. But any man who reflects must see that this is the price that we pay for the liberty that our Church, beyond all others, allows to its members and its officers. That liberty has repeatedly proved of the highest value. It has saved from extinction most valuable schools of thought which the Church could ill have spared. It has given the Church a more truly Catholic character than any other body of Christians now possesses. It has allowed a freer and truer study of God's works. It and it alone has made the Church national, and enabled it to satisfy those needs which only a National Church can satisfy.

Nothing would more seriously imperil this liberty than to commence a course of extorting declarations of opinion from those who happened to hold, or to be suspected of holding, whatever might be at the moment least popular. If this practice once began it would be easy to continue it, and to press it with perpetually increasing force. Those who now ask for it might live to find their own weapons turned against themselves with fatal effect. The pretext for such demands can be easily varied. Sometimes the plea is duty; sometimes charity and tenderness; sometimes the good of the Church. Sometimes the demand is enforced by a threat, and the declaration is made a condition of holding office. But the result is in every case the same; the first who yields may yield to persuasion; those who follow have to yield to compulsion. I have always refused to satisfy such demands, and must always continue to refuse. They seem to me inconsistent with the plainest duty to the Church and to our Lord. . . .

Probably no one but himself fully understood all the workings of his mind. But he was not without many friends in the contest; Dr. Benson promptly and chivalrously told out in the columns of *The Times* what he had learnt of his friend. He ends thus:—

. . . They who censure this *congé d'élire* know not the man. They know not the singleness, and truth, and patience; they know not the courage, the manliness, the life, which they would divert from the service of the Church; they know not, what is more, the power of inspiration, not short

of genius, which he has for others; the energy with which contact with him sets other men to work; how many a shadow springs before him into a reality. For, least of all, do they know his sympathetic charity and the might of his Christian faith.

We have yet to learn how we are to give our great institutes their true vitality; how we are to make ourselves worthy once more to be the Church of the masses—masses which it is my firm belief he will have helped powerfully to penetrate with the love of the Cross, the love of the Church, when *Essays and Reviews* are forgotten.

Thank God for the tokens which are abroad that other of our bishops too see somewhat of that great secret! But we cannot spare Dr. Temple.—Your obedient servant,

E. W. BENSON.

WELLINGTON COLLEGE,
Oct. 16 (1869).

Professor Hort, in thanking Dr. Benson for this letter, shows that he took the same fundamental view as Dr. Temple himself as to what the cause of liberty in the Church demanded.

HITCHIN, October 23, 1869.

MY DEAR BENSON—I cannot forbear sending you *quite* line of thanks for your letter about Temple. It comes to me as a personal benefit of the highest kind, and as, I trust and believe, an equally great benefit to the Church at large. Great indeed must have been the sacrifice of personal feeling involved in writing it; but I am sure you will be rewarded with the one fitting reward, the words not returning void. Not only have you supplied facts which it was needful to have known, but the voice in which you have spoken will go sounding on, and inspire thousands to look to Temple with eager hope, who would have barely tolerated him, or even loathed him . . .

I could wish you had not seemed to imply that Temple was merely deceived, and that his silence was due merely to personal grounds. Surely the one common purpose of all the writers in *E. and R.* (truthfully and truly expressed, I have always believed, in the prefatory words) was one in which he sympathises now and always; and surely he must feel that that purpose *was* gained by the publication. Like others he must lament the wide and deep

mischief wrought by the recklessness of some of the writers (and indeed I think of the whole scheme); but that need not blind him to the good work done. Surely the air is clearer ever since; and the ultimate power of the faith thereby immeasurably stronger. Of late the clouds have been somewhat gathering again; and nothing could be more opportune than Temple's promotion; not from his own worth only, but also, I cannot help thinking, *because* he has been lying under the ban; and yet has questioned no article of the Creed.—Ever yours,

F. J. A. HORT.

In the Diocese of Exeter he found a supporter in his old master, Mr. Sanders, then Prebendary in Exeter Cathedral, and in many others. But the chief burden of the defence was borne by his friend and former colleague in the Education Office, Canon Cook. His position was difficult. Amongst the strongest of the opponents were members of his own Chapter, and he was in danger of forfeiting their friendship. Moreover, the trend of his own mind in theology and general thought was conservative. But he stood manfully by his friend, though Temple's ways were not quite his ways. He desired that Temple should publicly disavow the opinions of his collaborators in *Essays and Reviews*; but this, as has been seen, Dr. Temple resolutely refused to do. Cook thought him wrong, and knew that his difficulties in defending him were increased by the refusal, as well as by his unwillingness, to disclose to the public those differences with the other writers which he admitted to his friends. But none the less he persevered. A great point was to secure the Bishop-nominate's election by the Chapter at Exeter. It is evident that, if the election had been refused, the appointment would still have been pressed. "If the opponents are a majority, Temple must come in another way," writes Dean Wellesley from Hawarden. "No opposition can

keep out Temple," writes the Dean again ; "but," he adds with his usual sagacity, "I dread the harm it will do to the Church and the more worthy of the opponents." To have over-ridden the Chapter would have been a most serious step. So great was the tension of feeling at the time that it might even have endangered the relations between Church and State ; and the effort to win his way after so forcible an entrance might have proved a task too great even for the new Bishop's courageous pertinacity. It was worth much to secure a majority in Temple's favour, and Canon Cook left no stone unturned. "The matter has become now too notorious in all its bearings for and against, for anything but disadvantage to Temple to be gained by any management of the election in his favour," writes Dean Wellesley with the true instinct of the gentleman and the courtier ; nor was Cook the man to make the attempt. But he spared no labour, assuring first one and then another of the members of the Greater Chapter, with whom the election rested, of the strength of his belief, both in the orthodoxy and the personal character of the Bishop-nominate. Gradually, by correspondence and by word of mouth, he leavened the whole diocese with a feeling of increased confidence. Cook's own reputation as a student of great learning and calm judgment carried much weight ; even those who could not listen, resisted with great reluctance. "If this is carried out, disestablishment or secession occupy the whole prospect before us," writes one of the Prebendaries in the exaggerated phrase of an over-wrought mind ; "but," he adds, "I must again ask pardon, this time, for my length ; but more than that, I regret my inability to put before you clearly my reasons for feeling *very very* strongly on the opposite side to you." "After all," writes another,

“your opinion cannot but have great weight ; and though I cannot say I am as yet prepared to agree with you, I shall be only very glad if I am able to arrive at the same conclusion.”

When the day of election came, nineteen answered to their names in the Chapter House. Thirteen voted for the election ; six against it ; four were absent. Dr. Temple was chosen by a majority of seven. It must not be forgotten that amongst the opposing minority were some of those who stood highest amongst the clergy in the diocese for character and devotion. They knew not what they were doing, but they were true to the system in which they had been trained.

It would be hard to exaggerate the obligation under which the *mitis sapientia* of Canon Cook had placed both the diocese and the Church at large. But the recalcitrants would not yet own defeat ; at the Confirmation which followed, they went so far as to render it necessary to summon Dr. Temple's elder sister, at short notice, to prove that he had been born in lawful wedlock ; and Mr. R. Lingen,¹ the secretary of the Education Department, his former colleague, came to testify to personal character. The scene in Bow Church was striking and historic. There appeared in opposition two of the beneficed clergy of the Exeter Diocese, headed by Bishop Trower, who was sub-dean of the Cathedral, and had acted as the coadjutor and deputy of Bishop Phillpotts during the last years of feebleness which terminated his strong and strenuous episcopate. There was the excitement of a crowd with the parade of a complex function in which civil and ecclesiastical elements were somewhat grotesquely combined. There has been opposition on more than one occasion of this kind, but for one reason or another it has always been

¹ The late Lord Lingen.

fruitless. It has never been judged legally permissible to decide the question on its own merits. On this occasion there was much legal disputation, but the Vicar-General, Sir Travers Twiss, ruled that the Archbishop, on whose behalf he acted, had no option but to carry out the Royal mandate which he had received.

It still remained to consummate the entrance upon the high office by the final act of Consecration. During the interval further attempts were made to draw the Bishop-elect from the position which he had taken up. The Bishop of Ely, unable to prevail upon Dr. Temple to make some declaration, did not see his way to present for Consecration, though consenting to take part in the act itself.¹ The Prime Minister himself could not understand the reason why Dr. Temple should still refuse to speak, and was unable to follow his logic in the matter. Even Dr. Benson, to whom he was almost an infallible guide, supplicates him to "break silence" on the eve of his Consecration, urging that now that "the crook of Christ's flock" was about to be put into his hands he should give the same measure of confidence which once, in disburdening his mind about *Essays and Reviews*, he had reposed, in the Sixth Form at Rugby School.²

But the strong man holds his ground. Dr. Benson in writing had expressed the mind of his other master, the Bishop of Lincoln, who had thus himself addressed Dr. Temple :—

November 13 (1869).

MY DEAR BISHOP-ELECT— . . . You have now a glorious opportunity of restoring peace to the Church of England. In her name I plead with you. I do not ask you to condemn the volume to which I have referred. But I do entreat you

¹ Letter of Bishop of Ely to Dr. Temple, Dec. 2, 1869.

² See "Rugby" Memoir, *supra*, p. 220.

to disclaim all responsibility for it, except so far as your own part of it is concerned. This, you may say, was done by anticipation in the preface. But the subsequent publication of numerous editions has neutralized that disavowal. Whether rightly or wrongly, the *Essays* are regarded by many as forming one connected whole; and the minds of many are now distressed and distracted by your coming to the episcopal office with that book in your hand. They who are thus disturbed may be in error. But will you not feel compassion for them? Will you not show your sympathy with them by uttering some words which will cost you little to speak, and which they will rejoice to hear?

I have referred to the example of ancient bishops, but may I not rise higher and speak of Apostles? How would S. Paul have acted in your circumstances?—he who said, “Who is weak and I am not weak, who is offended and I burn not?” How would Christ Himself have acted, who condescended to the weakness of His disciples, and would not cast a stumbling-block in the way even of His bitterest enemies? He “who had compassion on the ignorant and out of the way, for that He Himself also was compassed with infirmities.”

You may now imitate them. Will you not do it?

In his answer to the master, Dr. Temple had, doubtless, also the disciple in his mind:—

RUGBY, *November 26 (1869).*

MY LORD—I did not answer your letter at once because the extraordinary kindness, and even tenderness, which inspires it throughout made me desire to reconsider once more what I had often considered already, and to bring myself, if I could, to a different conclusion about my duty from that which I had previously formed.

But all consideration only brings me back to this, that the one safe rule for me to follow is the law of the Church of England. While I am neither refusing to say nor do what the law does not require, I am on safe ground; and the responsibility lies with the law and not with me. The moment I step beyond these limits, I take the responsibility on myself, and I cannot shift it; and whatever ill consequences may follow, the blame is mine.

It is true, my Lord, that what you propose is studiously, generously moderate. But to concede it is to concede the

whole principle. And while I am quite sure that very few indeed would be satisfied with what you propose, who are not in their hearts tolerably well satisfied already, I am sure, too, that were I to agree I should only lay myself open to fresh demands to which I could no longer return the one sufficient answer,—that I was keeping strictly within the limits of the law of the Church of England.

The examples that your Lordship sets before me have been present to my mind ever since I received your letter. If this were a question of sacrificing my own feelings to the good or comfort of others, such examples would be overwhelming. But the question is not one of feeling, but of duty; and if these examples are to aid in deciding what that duty is, I cannot forget that the same S. Paul who made himself, as you remind me, “all things to all men,” yet on another occasion, and that, too, when his conduct must have given the deepest pain to many devout Christians, and probably kept not a few religious Jews out of the Church altogether, notwithstanding, tells us that “he gave place by subjection, no not for an hour.”

It would be simply presumptuous in me to say what an Apostle would do, if he stood where I stand now. I should not, indeed, venture to quote the example of the Apostles at all if you had not first quoted it to me. But I am quite sure that no Apostle would do what he believed to be plainly wrong.

My Lord, I have a real reverence for your character; I cannot adequately express my sense of the kindness of your letter; but in this matter I am doing my duty in God’s sight to the best of my ability, and when I say that, I am sure that you will not press me further, but rather pray that if I am wrong I may have clearer light and firmer strength.—Yours gratefully,

F. EXON. (ELECT).

The day of the Consecration, December 21, 1869, came at last. It was the Festival of S. Thomas. There was a fitness in the day chosen. One of the most striking of Temple’s Rugby sermons had for its subject the doubts of S. Thomas. After speaking of doubts of levity, conceit, hardness, and of others which, though not sinful in themselves, become sins from the mode in which they are treated, he adds :—

Such doubts are sinful: of such we must beware, as we would beware of any sin accompanied by peculiar danger. But the natural doubts that come unbidden, and demand to be heard, are not sins at all, and we must not treat them as sins. One word will tell our duty in dealing with them all—Wait: wait in full trust that God will give you light as you want it; will teach you what is needed for your soul's health by ways of His own; will make clear at last what part of your doubt was a mere mistake, what part was well founded; above all, will make the very doubt of the loving soul the foundation of a faith that can never more be shaken. Can we suppose that to the end of his days S. Thomas ever needed again any arguments to convince him of our Lord's having risen from the grave, or that he would ever forget the thrilling moment when his hand touched His Master's wounded side? So, too, the Christian finds in the perplexities that God clears up a light even beyond the brightness of his earlier faith, for it is the light of the Face of Christ.¹

But at the very last came a delay which strained the feelings of the crowded congregation gathered in the Abbey to the uttermost. The gloom of a London fog stealing into the Abbey lent itself to the uneasiness and misgiving. The bishops to be consecrated were those appointed to the Sees of Bath and Wells, the Falkland Islands, and Exeter; and when, attended by their chaplains, they entered the Jerusalem chamber before passing into the Abbey, Dr. Jackson, the Bishop of London, presiding in the place of Archbishop Tait, who was ill, rose from his seat. He informed his brethren that he had at the last moment received protests from several of the bishops of the province against the Consecration of Dr. Temple, and notably one from the Bishop of Lincoln. Putting together all the protests, their meaning was that the Archbishop would not be acting in accordance with the law of the Church if he were to consecrate in the face of a protest from his suffragans. His own opinion, which had been

¹ "Doubts," Temple's Rugby Sermons, 1858-60.

fortified by the advice of the highest legal authorities, was that the Archbishop was bound to proceed, but he asked each of the bishops present to state his own view. The assisting prelates were the Bishop of S. David's (Dr. Thirlwall), the Bishop of Worcester (Dr. Philpott), and the Bishop of Ely (Dr. Harold Browne). Each in turn gave his voice against the acceptance of the protests. The Bishop of Ely, with his usual combination of modesty and learning, fortified his own judgment by the sanction of an appeal to a precedent of the primitive Church. With greater directness, the historian Bishop of S. David's briefly pronounced: "My judgment is that they cannot be received." Thus the last formal obstacle to the Consecration was withdrawn. The long procession filed its way into the great shrine round which gather so many memories and associations of Church and nation. In these Frederick Temple was henceforth to hold a place.

Although Temple's life was lived before the eyes of men he would not be spoken of as a man of many acquaintances, but he had not a few strong friends—none stronger than working-men. There was something in his rugged force and sturdiness of character which specially commended him to them, and he had done much to help the working-men of Rugby during his headmastership. In consequence they were much interested in his fortunes at this time, and sent a message to the working-men of Westminster asking them to make a demonstration in his favour at the Consecration. It was noticed that, during a pause in the service, a number of men in working clothes crowded into the Abbey and filled the Lantern. The reason was not known at the time, and the incident caused much surprise; but it was the dinner-hour, and their presence was the practical answer to the

request of their brethren in the Midlands. But his friends were of every class, and they gathered in strength on the day of his Consecration,—pupils who gave him something of hero-worship; Oxford contemporaries who were privy to the marvel of his early toil; official colleagues who had learnt to respect him while working with him; relations who owed him more than the ordinary obligations of kinship. Arthur Clough and Matthew Arnold were there, and Tom Hughes—the two first recalling Balliol days, and all seeing in him the revival of memories and the embodiment of a force which centred in Dr. Arnold. Arthur Stanley rejoiced in the sense that the Episcopate from which he hoped so much would be begun in his own beloved Minster. To one of the oldest of this band of friends, Lake, Fellow of Balliol, and afterwards Dean of Durham, had been confided the responsibility of the sermon. A true friend he always was, though contentious at times, and apt to use his real comprehensiveness of spirit so as to alienate rather than to attract. Temple, as was his wont, seemed to like him most when most he differed from him. On this occasion the old friend let his affection have full play, and the largeness of tone was employed wholly to conciliate. Thus he concludes:—

I have dwelt thus far upon certainty and simplicity of faith as alike essential to Christianity, because I believe that it is only by the union of these qualities that it can hope to hold its place in the world. But before I close let me refer to another characteristic of its spirit. In the earliest and best days of the Church the greatest men were largely tolerant of differences of opinion, and were ever ready to put the best construction upon the language of those whom they saw to be truly serving Christ. One single instance is enough to show my meaning. We all know that the greatest conflict of early Christianity was against Arianism, and the one man to whom we have, perhaps, owed the most since S. Paul was Athanasius. S. Basil, the greatest name in the Greek church, and who,

as Dr. Newman has observed, owed the success of his great episcopate to the support of the laity, was constantly harassed through life with the charge that he was an unbeliever at heart. He was in communion with the opponents of Athanasius; he had resolutely refused to separate himself from his early friends; and he was denounced to Athanasius as unworthy to be a bishop. How did Athanasius act? Did he exact from Basil some fresh assurance beyond the adoption of the Apostles' and the Nicene creeds? No; he, the great father of orthodoxy, simply wrote to enjoin Basil's diocese to obey him, and added that he had but condescended to the infirmities of the weak, and that they might well be happy to have received for their bishop a man so full of wisdom and of truth. . . . What Basil did and Athanasius commanded, we need not be afraid to imitate.

After the Consecration the centre of interest was transferred from Westminster to Exeter, where the enthronement took place on Wednesday, December 29. The Bishop spent the preceding night at Sowton Rectory with the incumbent, his old schoolmaster, Prebendary Sanders—afterwards to be promoted by him to the Archdeaconry of Exeter. It was a memorable meeting. In the lad whose strenuous struggle he had admired and aided, whose future advance to high station in the Church he, with other patrons of the boy, had predicted, the former headmaster now welcomed his Bishop. Prebendary Sanders was an inveterate Tory, both in politics and churchmanship; but for Temple he was even willing to sacrifice Toryism; he stood by him when the tide was against him before his coming, and though he grumbled at times, and was always a little uneasy as to where next the duckling whom he had reared might ask him to follow into deep waters, yet he was always absolutely loyal, true, like his pupil, to the core. The meeting was not without its amusing side. Dr. Temple, in the hurry of leaving Rugby, and with that occasional lapse from strict business

habits which showed him human, had forgotten to put the post-town on the letter which announced his coming. Hence there was no carriage to meet him at the small wayside station where he alighted, and the new Bishop made his entrance into the diocese in a country cart! "Oh dear, how dreadful," exclaimed the clergyman of the old school, "my Bishop to come to me in this way,—and now, how about to-morrow's sermon?" "I have thought about it, but I haven't had time to write a word of it; give me paper and pen and I will set to work after dinner."

Accordingly, after dinner the chaplain was sent out to say civil words to the village choir, which had come to welcome and pay homage, and the Bishop sat down to write his sermon. But the schoolmaster, knowing all that had taken place in the diocese, and all that might turn on the first sermon, was terribly anxious as to what was going to be said. "I must go in and see what he is writing," and so in he went. He returned with, "That introduction will do admirably—a great confession of faith; it couldn't be better." For a time he kept quiet, but soon he fidgeted again—"I must go in once more; he won't mind, will he?" "No, he won't mind, but I think he'll say what he's going to say; he generally does." This time the result was not so satisfactory: "He has got on that dreadful conscience." "Well, I think you had better leave him." And so the written sermon was completed. But it was not a written sermon that was preached. According to the usual tradition, the new Bishop slept outside the Cathedral City before his enthronement. The next morning he drove into Exeter. The streets were lined with a dense crowd; and when the procession of civic and cathedral dignitaries, accompanied by the clergy of the diocese, filed in at the west door, and passed under

the great window, now filled with memorial glass in honour of him who then first set foot in the Cathedral as Bishop, the great building was found to be full from one end to the other. The stately service moved on. The second lesson for the day was read by the dean. By one of those happy coincidences which not seldom follow from adherence to the usual order of the daily calendar, it opened with the words, "Paul, thou art permitted to speak for thyself." The opportunity had come. Recognizing that if he used a written sermon, the voice could not reach all that people which had come to hear, the Bishop, while holding to the fixed line of thought, discarded the manuscript, and thus broke silence :—

Ever since I first was told that it would be my duty to labour in this Diocese of Exeter, I have desired with an exceeding desire for the day to come when I might meet you face to face, and pour out before you all that is in my heart of devotion to you and to our common Master, our Lord God, the Son of God, Jesus Christ.

More followed in due order. The general argument was that as the Bible was supreme above all other books, so, and in a yet higher sense, our Lord was supreme above all created beings. The general tone of the sermon struck the keynote of spiritual harmony between the deepest things in past, present, and future. It was a noble sermon throughout ; but its chief force lay in the creed-like sentences of the opening, in which burst forth the convictions which had long been pent up. The sermon told upon the congregation and the whole diocese ; it was a revelation of the man. And so also was the insistence with which he had urged upon the Chapter, somewhat fearful of the length of the service, that however long it might be, the Holy Communion should form part of it.

The battle of principle was won ; and now the

time had come for the concessions to the tender conscience which he had always longed to be justified in making. "It is difficult for a man," wrote Dean Wellesley, "to make explanations with a bishopric hanging over his head." This difficulty was now withdrawn. He had stood by one section of his friends when principle demanded steadfastness; he would stand by another when principle demanded charity. And now, as always, he was beginning to feel his special responsibilities towards those immediately committed to his charge—as much as in him lay, he would remove all that stood between himself and his diocese. The way appeared to be open. He had always held the view that *Essays and Reviews* could not be regarded as a permanent work, and had already taken the opportunity to tell the editor that in his judgment the time had come for discontinuing the publication altogether. But while carefully considering how best he could either get it stopped or withdraw his own Essay, he still desired to be true to the principle upon which he had always acted, of not sacrificing in any degree the other writers. Accordingly, he had no intention of making any public declaration on the subject. In the latter object he was defeated by what he called a "blunder" of his own. Canon Cook had informed Archdeacon Freeman after the Consecration that no edition of *Essays and Reviews* would ever appear with the Bishop of Exeter's name in the list of writers. The Archdeacon asked for permission to mention this fact in Convocation. The Bishop, hastily reading the Archdeacon's letter, and mistaking in the somewhat illegible handwriting the word "Convocation" for "conversation," answered in the affirmative. Armed with this authority, Archdeacon Freeman made the corresponding statement in the Lower House of Convocation at the ensuing group of sessions in February. The

announcement was regarded as a public renunciation of Dr. Temple's previous position, and a character was at once given to the act different from what had been intended. Dean Stanley and others took alarm, and it became necessary for the Bishop to make a public statement. The incident was in itself to be regretted, but at least it brought this compensation, that the subject was closed by a full explanation of the whole case in Dr. Temple's own words :—

. . . I should very much have preferred letting this matter wait until hereafter, because it is almost impossible to express precisely in words that which a man feels and thinks in such a matter as this. He must, to a very great extent, let his life and his actions speak for him, and then his words will receive their natural interpretation; whereas I, new to the Episcopal office, and new to this House, can of course convey my meaning by words and words only, and they must be interpreted as best they can. . . . I cannot help regretting that, by a most unfortunate blunder of my own, the necessity is apparently laid upon me of speaking now. . . . The fact is, that a little while ago I had occasion to tell an intimate friend—a layman, of whose opinion I think very highly—that I had come to the conclusion that I would not republish my Essay. . . . Now, so long as there was any legal right at stake, it seemed to me the strongest of all possible duties that I should not sacrifice any such right in any way whatever, either directly or indirectly. . . . But after I had become Bishop of Exeter, and when this matter was pressed very earnestly upon me, and pressed upon me by some who certainly shared with me a conviction of the necessity of great liberty of opinion, I thought that at any rate I might do this without injustice to any one—I might yield to those who felt the matter so keenly, by, so far as I was concerned, withdrawing the Essay from publication. . . . But in telling a friend or two of my intention, I had not thought about Convocation at all, and it certainly never occurred to my mind that the announcement would first be made in Convocation, and would thus have an appearance of being intended to avoid or prevent any such discussion as might arise either in the Upper House or in the Lower House. On the contrary, I think that if there

is any place where such discussion may well be held, it is in these two Houses. . . . I felt certainly that the publication of one essay amongst others was a thing which might be allowed to Frederick Temple, but which was not, therefore, to be allowed to the Bishop of Exeter. . . . The Bishop of Exeter would be required, of course, to be more guarded in everything that he did, and would be required to see not only that what he himself published was what he approved, but also that everything else that was published with it, and might be confounded with it, was also approved; because it would be inevitable that his position would give it a kind of authority that it would not have of itself. . . .

One reason I have already dealt with—my great reason for withdrawing my Essay from future publication; but there was another. . . . When I was originally asked to join in writing for such a volume, my reason for agreeing to join was that I could not help being very much struck with the extraordinary reticence which then prevailed among the younger University men at both Universities, but especially at Oxford, and which seemed to me to be doing most serious mischief to their characters. . . . Men were unwilling to express doubts and perplexities which it was certainly far better that they should express. Such things, when they are kept in, always have a kind of importance which is quite inconsistent with their true value. Men magnify them; they brood over them and fancy they are very great; while, if they would only put them into words, in many cases they themselves would immediately begin to see how very much less their importance was than they had thought. . . . I think there is a much more reasonable and better tone in discussing great questions in consequence of the publication of that book. But when this matter came before me at the beginning of this year and I had to consider the whole subject—I thought that that work had really been done, and that to persist in the publication of the book now was not to persist in advocating certain principles, but to persist in maintaining a particular discussion of those principles which, as it seemed to me, instead of assisting the cause, had begun to hinder it. . . .

A great deal has been said about the mischief which that book has done, and I think that I am bound to say something on that point; and something, also, on the other side. I am not prepared to deny that the book has done mischief. . . . The fact is, that in all these cases a mischief of the

kind which the Bishop of Lichfield [Dr. Selwyn.—Ed.] describes is almost a necessary accompaniment of the progress of investigation; but as God has made us, it is simply impossible to stop that progress, and I, for my part, certainly cannot conceive how any one can think it desirable to stop it. . . . I am quite sure that the belief in the most fundamental points, if once it were supposed to be absolutely free from all investigation and from all question, would begin to lose its real vitality, and a belief without vitality seems to me to be not merely a negation, but a most positive and real mischief. . . . I do not mean that the necessity of free inquiry has no limits; far from it—but that in a Church like ours it is of the essence of the health of the Church that those limits should be as wide as it is possible, with any reasonable regard to community of spirit. . . .

But I wish to say a word or two more, as it seems to me to be a fitting opportunity to do so, on the general question. . . . It seems to me that, whether we like it or not, we are of necessity involved in what Dr. Arnold spoke of some years ago,—namely, the general discussion, all over the Christian world, of the degree and limits of the inspiration of the Bible. It is a question of absolutely enormous importance. The progress of discovery and historical research has made it quite impossible for us to leave it alone; it is forced upon us on every side. It is quite impossible that this great discussion should really come to a worthy end unless it is conducted with real freedom on the part of those who take any real share in it. . . . For my part, therefore, I think that such a discussion ought to be allowed the greatest freedom that can possibly be given it, consistent with the acknowledgment of the Bible as the supreme revelation, and with a reverent—a really reverent—spirit in the treatment of all subjects connected with it. . . . It would seem to me to be monstrous to discourage such a man as Dr. Arnold, or the late Dean of St. Paul's [Dr. Milman.—Ed.], because in many cases the conclusions to which they arrived were very different from those which are ordinarily accepted. It is not whether a man comes to this conclusion or to that, but it is with what temper, with what spirit, with what feelings he enters on the discussion. . . . I will conclude by saying that I am quite sure that no one has a more real reverence for God's Word, or a more entire desire to make it the guide of his life, than I have myself; and that there is no one who feels

more confident that the result of the freest inquiry in a reverent spirit will be to uphold the dignity and honour of that Word.¹

And here the matter ended. The actual storm ceased, although murmurings of the ground-swell were heard at intervals during the earlier part of Bishop Temple's Episcopate. Towards the close of this tempestuous passage to his bishopric there began to be signs of an overwrought spirit. They are seen in the Convocation episode,—tokens, to use the phrase of Dr. Benson, that 'the blade was wearing through the scabbard.' In the correspondence with Canon Cook during the incident, he speaks of having "hardly slept since Thursday" (four nights). And no wonder; for, in addition to the strain of this opposition, he was bearing the painful responsibility thrown upon him by events at Rugby in connexion with the appointment of his successor to the headmastership.² There were those who questioned his ultimate withdrawal from *Essays and Reviews*, just as there were those who blamed his initial and continued partnership. Against the criticism from one side and the other may be quoted the verdict of the judicial mind of Dr. Lightfoot:—

Temple's earliest acts and words, as a Bishop, inspire great hope. To my mind he has acted most nobly about *Essays and Reviews*,—courageous in refusing to withdraw his name when it was clamorously demanded, and not less courageous in withdrawing it now when the withdrawal will expose him to the criticism of his advanced friends.³

This will be the ultimate and general verdict. Mistakes there may have been of detail; but in all such cases it is the campaign as a whole,

¹ Chronicles of Convocation, Feb. 11, 1870.

² Editor's Supplement, vol. ii. p. 624.

³ Extract from a letter of Professor Lightfoot to Dr. Benson, Feb. 11, 1870.

and not each special incident, by which the ability of a leader is judged. Viewed in its entirety, it had been a noble contest nobly waged. With marvellous self-restraint he had kept the balance between the two sides of his full nature,—sympathetic personal regard for friends on the one hand, and conscientious convictions on the other; with wonderful courage he had stood firm to his fundamental principle that loyal Churchmanship and full Christian belief were consistent with a liberal standpoint in thought and action, and that this was the position which in this special generation would enable a man to do fullest service. To him may be applied words spoken of a great protagonist, from whom he was separated by time, and in the form, though not in the spirit, of his contention. “Only in Athanasius there was nothing observed throughout the course of that long tragedy, other than such as very well became a wise man to do and a righteous to suffer.”¹

He, too, had stood almost alone; and in a noble isolation, without interest or external advantage of any kind, had maintained his cause, and was now entering upon new duties in a life of enlarged service.

¹ Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, Bk. v. (42).

CHAPTER III

EARLY DAYS AT EXETER

The first tours—Blundell's school—Visits to towns.

A TWOFOLD interest, continuous and ever increasing, attaches to Bishop Temple's Exeter Episcopate; it is the history of a personal position gradually made good, and of a gradual infusion of a new spirit into a diocese. Few men could have entered upon office under greater difficulties than the new occupant of the See of Exeter. Those to whom Bishop Phillpotts deputed his duties during the increasing infirmities of a long old age had done their work conscientiously and with diligence; but no vicarious labour can be a substitute for the superintendence of the bishop himself. Irregularities and abuses were numerous, arrears of work had accumulated; new life in many departments of diocesan action was demanded, and the general level had need of elevation. It was necessary that the entire body corporate should be pulled together, and none were more conscious of the fact than the faithful officers of the aged bishop. The task would have been arduous for any man; its difficulties were intensified by the fact that the new Bishop entered a diocese still seething with the recent agitation directed against himself. Many of the laity and a far larger proportion of the clergy had been stirred into

opposition, and they included not a few of those who stood highest both in character and office. Many of the rural deaneries had memorialised against him, and the rural Dean of the mother city had been specially prominent in opposition. The Dean and Chapter were divided; the election of the Bishop had only been carried after a sharp contest; the Dean himself, though he had voted for the Bishop, was very uneasy. One of the three Archdeacons was a reluctant but strong opponent, anxiously divided between loyalty to his convictions and obligation to his ecclesiastical head. Seldom has a leader taken up a command with a less united force—"without were fightings, within were fears."

Gradually Bishop Temple built up his position. The work was slow, and there were checks at times, but no breaks. Suspicion gave place to trust; the strength and truth of the man won confidence. Before he left Exeter, fifteen years later, though there were still some who had never penetrated beneath the hard crust of the rude exterior, and never fully read the character, there was probably no diocese in England which felt so secure of itself in the hands of its bishop; and not a few of the clergy and laity—and some of them had at first been found among the ranks of opponents—were bound with strong ties of respect and love.

And all this time a new spirit was being infused into the diocese. The keynote of the previous Episcopate had been system. Bishop Phillpotts would probably have been spoken of by an old chronicler as "a very stark" man. He was certainly set for the punishment of evil-doers, and he was the terror of opponents. He wielded his weapons with great courage and exquisite skill. A perfect swordsman in controversial warfare, he

knew every thrust and parry of his art. Great as the champion of orthodoxy, he was great also in diocesan administration and discipline. Indeed, he feared no foe, either at home or abroad. Once, as the latest biographer of Wellington records,¹ he made bold to rebuke the iron Duke himself for infrequency at public worship on the Lord's Day, and the great soldier, owning his right to speak, received the rebuke with all humility. Bishop Phillpotts was greatly regarded by many of his clergy and feared by all; and that there was a real nobility in the undaunted front with which he met all foes, none will deny: always he was a great upholder of a cause, and often a true champion of the Faith. But his aim was rather the perfecting of a machine than the development of a life. There was but little love in the rule; and able and, in some ways, great as he was, his Episcopate had no reconciling power—it accentuated differences, it did not soften them or mediate between them. For machinery Bishop Temple substituted organised life, and into system he infused the spirit of service.

But it was done gradually, and without pose or programme or even conscious policy. Bishop Temple disliked these things. Very late in life he was heard to say: "They want me to formulate a policy; I don't believe in formulated policies." In early days at Exeter, when told of a former pupil who on entering upon a living had put out a programme as to the lines on which he intended to administer his parish, he had said: "Oh, that is a very young thing to do." A groundwork of underlying principles there always was; a diapason, in which progressive tendency was blended with the best music of the older days, always ran through the harmony of his life; unquenchable desire for justice and righteousness, and for the higher life in

¹ Maxwell's *Life of Wellington*, vol. ii. pp. 278-280.

fellowship with God, burnt as a flame within him. But there was no parade; for him the kingdom of God came not "with observation." He went about his work with purpose large and fixed; but he did things without saying that he meant to do them. And slowly, and almost without knowing, the diocese became indoctrinated—clergy and laity did not realise that they were changing, but the change came. Dean Cowie spoke with his usual sagacity and insight—and the tribute, coming from one who in his time had known well what hard work was, meant much—when at the end of the Episcopate he said, "I have heard for years of your wonderful organisation of the work,—and no doubt fitting everything precisely into its time is of very great service,—but the thing that strikes me is that in the parts of Devonshire that I have known, every clergyman is half-unconsciously doing twice as much as he did before, and they all say it is your doing."

And imperceptibly this change produced another,—through service came reconciliation. While High and Low Churchmen were working together the edges and angles were worn off; they began to feel that they were no longer in different camps, as the previous régime had placed them. The tendency spread. Liberals and Conservatives, clergy and laity, were drawn to each other. Service was the order of the day, and there was some service which even Nonconformists and Churchmen could render in common. Above all, service was the great reconciling medium between the Bishop and his flock. Through his life of service the diocese learnt to know what manner of man he really was who had come amongst them under so dark a cloud of suspicion. As he went in and out amongst them men learnt by accompanying with him how strong was his faith, how

deep his devotion, and their hearts were drawn together.

‘If I once get amongst them I have little doubt of winning them,’ wrote Bishop Temple to his friend, Lord Coleridge.¹ His one policy was to know and be known. Accordingly, his first step was to arrange a diocesan tour. It was his way, not so much to make opportunities as to avail himself of those which came naturally ; and thus the tour was made to centre round the Confirmations. Few better opportunities could have been taken, for the Bishop was always at his best in his Confirmation Charges. He wisely thought that the best plan for instilling the spirit of service into the diocese was to set the diocese to do its own work. Accordingly he brought no staff from outside with him—with the exception of his examining chaplain, Arthur Butler, a Fellow of Oriel, formerly one of his colleagues at Rugby, and afterwards Headmaster of Haileybury, and Ernest Sandford, one of his earliest pupils, whom he made his resident chaplain. With the latter for his only companion, he traversed, in a short time, both the counties of Devon and Cornwall. The retinue brings no recollection of the mediæval bishop ; but for ubiquity he matched the most diligent of them, Bronescombe, Stapeldon, or Grandisson. The remotest country parishes were visited—the inhabitants of which had never seen a bishop before—as well as the more populous towns. Sometimes it was but a handful of half-taught country boys and girls that was presented to him ; but to these, equally with the larger congregations and fully prepared candidates, he poured out the full force of his earnest spirit in strong but simple words. Sometimes the leader and his young companion were brought into strange places, where

¹ *Supra*, p. 285.

there was but little culture even in the parsonage itself. "Do you ever read any books?" "Yes, we see the *Gardener's Chronicle* once a month." Sometimes there was little evidence of pastoral care. "How are you, my good woman?" said the not very diligent clergyman, wishing to make the best of himself before his Bishop, "How are you, and how is your rheumatism?" "You haven't done much to make it better. You haven't been near me these six weeks." But the Bishop's sense of humour and justice were both roused, and the somewhat ill-natured attempt to prejudice the clergyman did not meet with much response. There were churches so fully boxed up with pews that the building seemed to be empty when it was first entered; though in reality it was full of candidates, no form was visible except that of the old leader of the choir, perched up in the west gallery, with his bass viol. In one parish the candidates were said to be "out in the lanes somewhere," and had to be gathered into church by the friendly schoolmistress of a neighbouring parish. The old rector himself hung his surplice over the end of a high pew in which he took refuge, whilst a kindly curate from outside superintended the order of the service. When all was over, the Bishop was invited, by the aged incumbent, to "come and take a glass of port," but was met, somewhat curtly, by the answer, "Thank you; I do not drink wine." To the suggestion that it might be better for him to resign after so many years of service, he brought answer in person, when some time had been taken for consideration, that he was "going to marry again," and that "the new wife would be as good as a curate."

And there were sadder cases than these; or if, under the stricter discipline of Bishop Phillpotts, the worst delinquents of all had gradually been

hunted down, the memories of their evil deeds still remained as a curse to the parishes which had known them, an influence which depressed the whole moral tone of the neighbourhood, and lowered the reputation of the Church of England in the estimate of the most God-fearing of the people.

But these evil-doers formed the small minority. Not all who were strangers to the due order of clerical life were wholly secular in tone. The country parishes were often in the hands of men—"squarsons," they were called—who were half country gentlemen and half parish priests, with a leaning to the former class. Every one knew them, and they were the friends of the whole countryside. Often they acted as the doctors and lawyers of the parish, and almost always they were fond of sport. But theirs was a genial and a neighbourly influence, and on the whole it made for the moral healthiness of those amongst whom they lived, and gave them as much of the spiritual and religious side of life as the generality were able to receive. Above all, they were peacemakers. One of the best known of them was the Rev. John Russell, Vicar of Swymbridge, in North Devon. At his funeral, some years later, the entire neighbourhood was gathered—clergy, squires, farmers, young and old—all sorts and conditions of men; and amongst them, not a few of the Gipsy tribe whom he often met when riding to the meet. They used to bring their children to him to be baptized, and regarded him as a kind of patron of their class. As the great concourse moved away from the graveside, a farmer was asked what he thought was the secret of this widespread regard. "Oh, sir," he said, "he wasn't very much of a parson, you know, in the way of visiting and such like; *but he was such a man to make peace in a parish.*"

And then he told the tale of a chance meeting with Mr. Russell on the roadside, of the turning of the horse's head in consequence of a conversation which then took place, of a visit paid to a sick man's bed, and a reconciliation brought about between a nephew and a dying uncle by a few plain words of homely kindness and common-sense. With men of this type Bishop Temple was always on friendly terms. He understood them, and perhaps winked at some of their irregularities because of what was sterling in them; and they respected him, and pulled themselves together into some approach to conformity to rule, because they recognised the man under the dress of the Bishop. There was the touch of a common nature which made them kin. The first meeting between Mr. Russell and his Diocesan speaks for itself: "Well, my Lord, I have ridden five-and-twenty miles before breakfast to see you." "Well, Mr. Russell, I wouldn't have *ridden* them; but I might have *walked* them."

And there was another class of clergyman, whom Bishop Temple came across in such visits to scattered parishes, that was congenial to him. Perhaps there is less variety of clerical type under the more organised system of the present day; and certainly, with the disappearance of clerical Fellows, the scholarly clergyman holding a sequestered living tends to disappear. These men he met, and cheered them with the welcome companionship of a culture which, amidst their ordinary surroundings, they greatly missed. The Double First-Class man was at home both with buried mathematician and solitary classic.

And there were others who rejoiced him yet more. Sometimes, at the close of a long day, a country parsonage might be reached, which was a very oasis in a desert land, or, at least, a home of

spiritual refreshment in the midst of that which was ordinary and commonplace. John Keble had his followers; the line traced through George Herbert to the parish priest of Chaucer, and farther back still to S. Aidan and the first fathers of the Anglican clergy, was not extinct. Like them, the representatives who received Bishop Temple, while members of a spiritual order, mingled with their flocks. They were known as "men of God"; and the very look, however simple, of the parish church, witnessed that the House of God was their first care. But they were not a separate caste; they were friends, whose kindly influence was inspiration and comfort to a whole parish and neighbourhood, lifting and making happy all around. In one of them the knowledge of affairs might be more conspicuous; another might have more affinity with things ecclesiastical and perhaps the religious life,—he had more of the saint about him;—but, in both cases, they were the men through whose quiet, continuous ministry in school, church, and parish, light spread, life was raised, homes were kept pure. They were "the salt of the earth"; and if they did not at once understand and trust their new Bishop, the instincts of a spiritual birthright which they shared in common drew them together before long; they became his closest friends.

But not the clergy only were drawn by these visits. The business capacity and knowledge of affairs attracted professional men. The farmers saw that here was no make-believe farmer, but a man who had himself followed the plough. Teachers bowed before a teacher whose authority and knowledge they recognised. Educated and cultured men, and men of political aptitude and experience, saw one who could meet them on more than equal terms upon their own ground. He

was brusque and somewhat awe-inspiring at times, but he was evidently very fond of young people and little children; and if he did not partake of all the prepared dainties, he made himself at home in the house, and liked homely and friendly ways. And so even the lady and daughters of the house began to own a liking and a fascination, which sometimes ripened into a close intimacy with a whole family. Above all, it was plain to all that he had a right to call Devonshire and Cornwall his own: who then more fitted to be Bishop of the West Country? Yes, he had a right to be Bishop; for when the whole parish, young and old, Nonconformist and Churchman—for once at any rate all together—crowded into the parish church, and listened to the strong man's words, so simple but so intense, who could doubt that he had the root of the matter in him, nay more, that he had a message from God to deliver, and was fit to be set to rule the Church of God! The message was so full and yet so personal; hearers did not stay to ask whether they were Churchmen or Nonconformists,—Christ was drawing them all, for this man was full of His great and rich Gospel,—and Christ was speaking to each, for this man was full of His intensity of spirit. As Christ's gracious invitation, "Come unto Me all ye that labour and are heavy laden," swept across the great congregation in the Cornish church and found its way into responsive hearts, each man felt that Christ was calling him. And those straight, simple words of the Confirmation Charge told the young men that they came from one who entered into a young man's temptations. The mother, watching the Confirmation of her daughter, felt that what was said about the great Father's care through life, and the presence of love which filled the Holy Communion with its power, were the revelations

of her daughter's needs, because they spoke of all that the experience of life had taught her of her own. These words are memories now, but the virtue has not gone out of them for many; to not a few, both in the quiet nooks of the country parish and the crowded walks of fashionable society, they still speak at times, 'minding them of a better choice'; they recall one who was a true Bishop, and is still, maybe, bidding them return to the Shepherd and Bishop of their souls.

This was the expression of the graver and more intense element in Bishop Temple. On the lighter and more personal side the tour revealed him also. To his companion, as he drove beside him, different characteristics of the man were perpetually coming out—his many-sidedness, his knowledge of men and affairs, his interest in interpreting different passages in the Bible, his love of the English poets, especially Wordsworth and Shelley, and of the works of Coleridge; the playful changes from these to reminiscences of nursery rhymes and children's literature, and the political squibs of former days. Above all, his practical acquaintance with country life and ways was seen—his delight in the tors and streams, and in the abundance of fern, gorse, and heather, which carpeted the ground, and by their rich colouring relieved the grey monotony of the moor. He watched the gleams of sunlight and the shadows cast by the clouds as they passed overhead, and he noted the silvery haze throwing its soft grace over valley and hill as one of Devonshire's special charms. He called each flower by its name; he knew almost each inch of the ground and each turn of the winding lanes, for he had traversed them in early school-days or during the long walking tours of after years. Sometimes he sat silent, drinking it all in, the glass fixed in the upturned eye to aid

the once clear sight, which was already beginning to fail. Suddenly he would break out with some pregnant words about the deeper things of life, or shrewd observations about men and events. Sometimes he would recall University days—Ward and Newman, and the Oxford Movement and all that it meant and taught, where he thought it right and where wrong. At rare intervals he would open his mind about thoughts and plans for the diocese, and tell of his difficulties and hopes. He whom men called hard had a very human and tender side, which made itself manifest in this intercourse, and it is with something better than pride that such words are recalled as—"The help in work is something, but I want the companionship more"; or again, "Young men do not always recognise how much they can help their elders by simply being with them."

Such was the Bishop's first tour in his diocese, a type of many that followed it. But, besides the tour must be noted individual visits to certain places, and the special functions of stated occasions. Places connected with his early years had a claim on him which he did not neglect. He was soon in Cornwall, commencing his official connexion with it at Saltash, where he spoke of his grandfather as "rector of a Cornish parish," and of his father and mother and "all her ancestors for a long way back as Cornish; so that when he came into Cornwall he was come among his kinsfolk, and the welcome he got was not merely from among friends, but from those whom he looked upon as relations."¹ Later on he was at S. Gluvias, his grandfather's parish, where he became a frequent visitor at the house of the then vicar, Archdeacon of Cornwall and Chancellor of the diocese, who was a son of Bishop Phillpotts, and whose own son had been one

¹ *Exeter and Plymouth Gazette*, January 1870.

of Bishop Temple's assistant masters at Rugby. Later still he visited Probus, his mother's home. But before he was at the two last-named places he went to Barnstaple, to re-open the church of Holy Trinity. At the public welcome which North Devon gave him at this first visit, he alluded to the fact that when he came to England his father first brought his family to North Devon. "Your welcome," he said, "gives me the greater pleasure, because my earliest childhood in England was spent in this part of Devonshire; Bideford and Barnstaple, and the towns all round on this side of Devonshire, are quite familiar to me from my earliest recollections; and I feel, even more here than anywhere else in the county, as if I were coming back to a place which I have known longer, and loved more dearly than almost any other place. . . Although there are other parts of Devonshire that perhaps I have known better, there is no other part I have known so long."¹ It was to Culmstock, however, and its neighbourhood that his steps most readily turned.² He always remembered Culmstock, and the feeling was reciprocal. The parish church has for many years contained a stained window which recalls his recollection of the family home; and it now holds a memorial brass telling of the pride of the parish in the Bishop and Archbishop whom they knew as a boy. It is not surprising to read that on the occasion of his first visit as Bishop, "the inhabitants came from miles around to hear" him; that "the interior of the fine old church was crowded"; and that "after the services the parishioners clustered around"³ to exchange greetings and revive old memories.

¹ *Exeter and Plymouth Gazette*, January 1870. .

² "Earlier Years" Memoir, pp. 23-26. . .

³ *Exeter and Plymouth Gazette*, April 1870.

The celebration at Blundell's School followed hard upon the visit to the parish as by a natural sequence. A great gathering (numbering more than two hundred) of old school-fellows, masters, past and present, and friends of the school met at Blundell's on April 22 in honour of the old school-boy who was now the Bishop of Exeter. Some were there whose family name recalled the Governors that had given Temple his exhibition twenty-one years before. The Lord-Lieutenant, Earl Devon, chairman of the Governors, presided, doing honour to a great Blundellian. Prebendary Sanders was there, rejoicing in the high fulfilment of the hopes which he had formed for his pupil. The atmosphere of school-life was always to Dr. Temple like a whiff of his native air, the whole man freshened and brightened in it. Even in old age, when the Canterbury choristers were sitting round him, he seemed young again. At Tiverton, more than anywhere else, youth came back; memory was all on the alert here, where, as the simple letters of the young schoolboy to his mother recall, he had "fagged" so hard, bent on doing his very best by himself for the sake of those at home; here where he loved to fancy that he could look out upon Culmstock and Axon and see all the household at their daily work;¹ here where he had made his "dearest friend," Robert Lawson, and had walked with him along the banks of the Loman and the Exe; here where he had played hard as well as worked hard; here where with simple but real purpose he had laid the foundations of his strong and strenuous life. Those early letters are couched in the style of Frederick Temple and not of William Wordsworth, but they recall the poet's account in the "Prelude" of his own school-days at Hawkeshead; and the memory forms the

¹ Editor's Supplement, vol. ii. p. 405.

mental background of his speech at the Tiverton banquet,¹ and gives feeling and force to the words.

There was no mistaking the ring of genuine affection in his words. Coming from Bishop Temple they meant future work on the school's behalf. How full was the measure of service and how fitting is the memorial which Blundellians have now raised to their great schoolfellow is best told in the words of the present Headmaster :—

Dr. Temple, then Bishop of Exeter, was one of the Governors appointed under the new scheme for the administration of the foundation dating August 12, 1876. He attended the first meeting of the new Governing Body on January 10, 1877 ; and at the next meeting was placed on the Committee formed to consider the practicability of providing a new site and new buildings for the school. Although deeply attached to the old site, which was endeared to him by so many associations, Dr. Temple felt that the change was inevitable, and with characteristic loyalty devoted himself heartily to an uncongenial task. . . .

On the 25th of June 1880 the foundation-stone of the new school was laid at Horsdon, about a mile from the town, by the Earl of Devon, chairman of the Governors, the short service being read by the Bishop of Exeter. After the service, a large meeting was held at the old school, in support of a movement for providing a School Chapel, a purpose for which the Governors had no right to employ the property of the Foundation. . . . No one who was present can forget the passionate pleading of the Bishop. From the moment when he spoke the success of the scheme was assured, and he was himself a most generous contributor to the fund. At the consecration of the chapel in 1883 the Bishop preached, showing how men bear through life, for good or ill, the impress of their school, and how the hearts and memories of old scholars linger fondly round the chapel as the influence to which they owe their higher selves, their sense of brotherhood in the service of Christ.

When the Bishop was translated to the See of London we felt his loss very deeply, for of course it was impossible for him to attend Governors' meetings, and it was only on

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, *supra*, p. 3f.

rare, but always delightful, occasions that we saw him. Most of all, we missed his Confirmation addresses, which, coming from the lips of one who always kept his quick sympathy with boys, never failed to leave a lasting impression.

But although Dr. Temple was far away from us and absorbed in the cares of a very busy life, he never lost touch with the school, and at our Old Boys' dinners, and other such times when we were privileged to see him, he showed himself full of interest in the school, and a gathering of past or present Blundellians never failed to make him almost a boy again. Those who had only known him as the stern prelate and busy man of affairs, were amazed at the overflowing human and sheer rollicking fun which he could display when enjoying such a brief respite from his cares. At the next meeting of Old Boys, after his death, one of those gatherings at which his revered face had been so familiar, some attempt was made to express the feeling of his old schoolfellows in these words:—

“We are meeting here to-night under the shadow of a heavy loss. The great Archbishop, whose name lent such distinction to his old school, has passed away in the fulness of days and of honours. To one who reads the countless and various tributes to the inspiring story of his long career, there stands forth a clear-cut, commanding personality, unique in our time. . . . To us of Blundell's the loss is nearer and more personal. We honoured him not less than others, and we loved him more because we knew him better. And we have lost him. This should have been a time of rejoicing; this our first meeting after the stately pageant of last summer, in which he was so noble and pathetic a figure. We feel as England felt after Nelson's death in the hour of victory. Gladly could we spare our triumph, could we but see him here to-night, could we hear once more his hearty laugh and watch his smile, surely the most bewitching that ever lit up so stern a face, a smile in which were distilled the bubbling mirth of boyhood and the mellowed kindness of age. We have lost all this. But his spirit is still with us. . . . His memory is a priceless inheritance to Blundell's, to sanctify and ennoble our aims; and his figure will stand out to the nation like a great steady beacon on a hill, to cheer and enlighten the path of duty.”¹

¹ *Blundell's Worthies*, pp. 193, 194.

Hitherto the new Bishop had been seen in the less populous parts of the diocese, winning his way with its individual or sectional life ; but it is when he comes into the towns, face to face with men on the collective side, that the real power of the man is best revealed. Those who knew him in his later years were struck by the great exhibition of dogged determination and unwearied toil, but they can scarcely realise the vigour and freshness with which he sprang to work in the first days of his Episcopate. It was specially notable when he met great gatherings of his fellow-men in the larger towns. He was, of course, much in request in Exeter, Torquay, and Plymouth ; and here first came prominently into view the wider outlook, the power of grasping large questions and of swaying multitudes. He warmed to his work ; the resolute bearing, the measured but fervent utterance, the kindling eye, showed that he was in his element as the citizen-Bishop. He was a born leader, and he had a kind of joyous but simple consciousness of strength in leading in those early days, which finds expression in such words as these : "Coming into that diocese, he felt sure at any rate that he could count upon the clergy to support him . . . because wherever he went he found that all they wanted was a *leader who would lead*, and that it would be his fault and not theirs if they hung back. He found, too, that not the Clergy only, but also the Laity, were ready to co-operate in the work of the Church."¹ Some years before, with the premature sense of failing strength which momentarily comes upon men in middle life, he had spoken in a letter to a friend of life's work being more than half done ; but because the exact sphere which called out his full powers was found, it seems as though now he had first begun to live. He brims over

¹ "Visit to Westward Ho !" *Western Morning News*, March 1870.

with energy; "horribly vigorous he is," said a clergyman once in the weakness of the flesh; but they liked the vigour none the less, and specially from the mass the response came from the first. The exuberant cordiality with which he was welcomed by the overcrowded meetings showed that the suspicion entertained by some of the clergy was not shared by the people at large. This exhibition of strenuous hard work in the open, of common humanity, of sympathy not confined to things ecclesiastical, but stretching out towards all life, was a new revelation of a bishop; before they had heard of an ecclesiastic, now they welcomed a man.

Perhaps two speeches of his may serve to bring home the breadth and all-roundness which won upon the common life of the diocese. The first was made at the visit of welcome to the Bishop at Plymouth on the occasion of the presentation of prizes to the successful students at the Art and Science Schools. Delivered more than a third of a century ago, it is a remarkable illustration of his prescience, no less than of his keen interest in problems affecting national life.

I believe that these Science Schools are not only of very great value in the present, but that they are of very great importance for the future. Although your Science School, Mr. President, seems very successful, and a very good one as far as it goes, yet allow me to say that I look upon it as only the nucleus of what hereafter I shall hope to see in such a town as Plymouth. . . . I was, not very long ago, a member of the Schools Inquiry Commission, a Commission the object of which was to inquire into the state of education all over England, and particularly the education of those whose education had not been the subject of inquiry before. . . . Whilst we were engaged on this Commission, before we had finished our labours, the French Exhibition took place, and from those who went from England there we had a very large number of letters written in very great alarm. . . . It was said that there were plainly visible in that Exhibition

proofs of the most extraordinary progress by all other countries in that in which we had previously been superior ; that in their manufactures, for instance, they were rapidly approaching our level ; and that, on the other hand, we were by no means making remarkable progress in those respects in which they had previously been superior to us. It was said that our workmen were distinctly falling back, that they were falling back partly for the reason that foreign workmen were so much better educated than ours. It was said that, go where you would, all over the continent of Europe, foreign workmen were instructed in the principles of their work, that they knew the science that lay at the bottom of all their occupations, that they knew the principles of art where art was necessary, that they were thoroughly cultivated so far as it was required for the business they had to do. It was said, on the contrary, that the English workman, as a general rule, even if he were a skilled workman, was only skilled in this sense, that he was able to do a particular thing that he had been taught ; that he did not understand the reasons, and was unable, in any degree, in consequence of having no knowledge of those reasons, to vary his work, and to adapt it to new circumstances, or to get at that sort of grace and finish which can only be given by thoroughly intelligent people. . . . But for all that I do not believe the alarm was well founded, because I have observed it is the way with Englishmen to grumble and then go and set the thing right. And I have no doubt at all, and I had no doubt at all then, that we should begin to grumble at the superiority of those foreigners, and then when we had grumbled sufficiently, that we should set to work to put it right. . . .

That is one reason why I rejoice so much at the establishment of such schools as these. Let me give another reason. We are now entered upon what a foreign philosopher has called the "industrial phase of society"—that is, the time has come when he who can do the most for the benefit of his fellow-creatures, either in the way of instructing them or in the way of comforting them, in promoting either their improvement or their happiness, whether a labourer with his head and his heart, or a labourer with his hands, will be reckoned as the most important person in society. . . .

Another reason is this. These schools provide one most important means by which men of all classes, including even the lowest, can, if they have any ability at all, really get

some thorough cultivation of their minds. There can be no greater improvement to any one's mind than that he should thoroughly master the principles of his own work, that by which he is to live. . . . I look upon it as one of the greatest benefits that can be conferred upon a working-man that he should be enabled to cultivate his own mind, and the directest and easiest way to cultivate his own mind is to enable him to acquire the principles of his own occupation. I should be very glad to see a very much larger cultivation of the understanding in other ways besides that which these schools contemplate—namely, besides Science and Art. I should like to see working-men engaged, in every possible way, in the study of literature as well. But I know perfectly well that literature is some way off; and that Science and Art on the contrary are close at hand. . . .¹

The second speech is an address at Exeter to Friendly Societies, and exhibits that combination of kindness of heart with the insistence on the principle of self-help, which were leading characteristics of the man, and had already begun to win him his great popularity with these institutions:—

. . . To tell you the truth, I am quite taken by surprise to-night at the great numbers that I find here, for I had not any idea that there would be so many who were desirous of giving me so warm a welcome. As long as I live I am sure I shall never forget the sight of this room, nor the warmth which I can see in your faces and recognise in your voices. The last question which I had to answer when I was consecrated to the office of Bishop was, whether I would be kind and merciful, for Christ's sake, to the poor and needy; and it seemed as if it were the climax of all the other questions; and that the last thing and the highest, to which all the others led up, was not so much what views I held, what was my belief, but rather whether I was willing to do my best for my fellow-men.

It is a great pleasure for me to receive such a welcome, not only from the class to which you belong, but especially from the Friendly Societies which you have formed—because these Societies illustrate, better than anything else, at once the sympathy which I feel for you all, and the path in which

¹ *Exeter and Plymouth Gazette*, January 1870.

we can most help each other. We know perfectly well that if we give each other aid we do very often run a serious risk of doing each other mischief. Repeatedly it has been seen that misdirected charity has done a great deal more harm to the objects of that charity than those who bestowed it were ever able afterwards to do good. . . . We are not permitted simply to help each other on the impulse of the moment, as if it were a thing that could be treated as a small concern. No; it has been purposely made a difficult duty in order that it may demand from us our time, our thought, our self-restraint, and our prudence. . . . Look at the growth of our Friendly Societies. They have been in existence now for nearly two centuries, and many of them have come to ruin and have brought serious hurt to those who were interested in them. . . . Was it possible to prevent this? It may be that in a few cases very good advice might have been given as to the best mode of preventing it, but in reality the good working of these Societies depends upon the efficiency of the management, and the efficiency of the management is a thing that can only be learnt by practice and experience, in the stead of which no advice in the world can stand. . . . The Chairman spoke to you of my past life, and what I had to do with the matter of education, and the presenter of the address alluded to the same subject. Let me say to you that if there is anything in which it is possible for us directly to aid each other, it is just at this point. . . . In promoting education it is possible that I may be of real use to you, and that in any measures that may be produced you also may be of real use to me. For any one of you who knows any trade knows perfectly well that no man can learn it unless the man who is learning chooses to learn it. But it is not only of the education of yourselves I am thinking. I am speaking also of the education of your children. There, too, depend upon it, the same holds good. You may have the best possible schools, the best possible management, but unless the parents really care about education, unless they make the children feel that education is in their eyes a matter of the utmost importance, unless by constantly showing an unvarying interest they make their children understand that it is a thing to which the children are to give their energy, depend upon it there will be no results worth getting. Our real chance of getting our children educated depends upon our really desiring that the children should be educated: and I say this the more earnestly to you, members of Friendly

Societies, because the very fact of your belonging to such societies shows that you look forward to the future, to providing for your own households. And surely you will take forethought for your own children. Remember that by-and-by the difference between the educated and the uneducated man, the man who has really been properly trained in his calling and the man who has not, will be just the difference between the comforts and discomforts of life. . . . Remember that nine-tenths of the success of any system of education must depend upon the people, and only one-tenth upon the organisation itself.¹

The strenuous life and earnest words soon began to tell, and all the more because there was no evidence of premeditated plan. The Bishop did his duty—that was all. There was no proclaiming of a vocation. He was not the superior man going forth to exhibit and justify a purpose: he did not set himself to win, but from the first he was on his way to win, because from the first he came to serve.

¹ *Western Morning News*, January 22, 1870.

CHAPTER IV

EDUCATIONAL POLICY

Endowed Schools Act, 1869—Secondary education (Schools Inquiry Commission).—Elementary education (Mr. Forster's Education Act, 1870)—The educational position in the Diocese of Exeter—The Bishop's schemes for meeting the situation.

DR. TEMPLE found his first opportunity of winning his diocese in fields of work that were comparatively new to him; the second came in a field with which he had long been familiar. He was already a recognised authority on all branches of education, and he came with laurels fresh from his success at Rugby, and from the reputation which he had gained for sound judgment and efficiency on the Schools Inquiry Commission. This reputation endured and grew. "It was worth while holding this Commission," said one who had served under Dr. Temple as assistant on this Commission, and was chairman of another thirty years afterwards, "if only for the sake of getting Bishop Temple's evidence." The reputation of him, above all others, which survives amongst younger men is that "he was a profound critic of educational methods and aims."¹ By more than a happy coincidence he came into the diocese at a time when education,

¹ Speech of Master of Balliol at Tercentenary of Blundell's School, June 29, 1904.

both Primary and Secondary, was immediately before the country. The schemes for the reorganisation of endowed schools which followed upon the Report of the Commission were now being launched, and an assistant Commissioner, the late Sir Joshua Fitch, was about to pay a preparatory visit to Devonshire on the subject.

Mr. Forster's celebrated Bill for dealing with Primary Education was also before Parliament. The new Bishop's counsel was sought and welcomed, and the schemes as well as the Act itself bear many marks of the Bishop's hand.

The feature which on retrospect is most noteworthy is the breadth and boldness with which Dr. Temple handled the whole question; they speak out in his every utterance; they impart a fresh breeziness to the atmosphere in which he moves. He is following in the steps of the educational bishops, notably Stapeldon, of the Middle Ages. Like that good bishop he is the patron of enlightenment, and takes thought for poverty; but there is a new spirit of liberty in Temple's action, born of the Reformation, and true to his own attitude when he entered on the diocese. He stands for religious education, but he has no fears. Knowledge in itself is a good thing; secular education is better than no education; individual self-development is the birth-right of men spiritually free.

It is for the interest of the Church of England (he says at the Middle School at West Buckland), and it is almost essential for the due discharge of our work in that Church, that all the people should be, so far as it is possible, an educated people. It is impossible for any one to know anything of the history of this Church, ever since the time of the Reformation, without perceiving that the very essential characteristic of it was that it called upon all men to direct their own conduct. . . . The very theory of the Church before the Reformation was that the laity were children; the theory of the Church of England now is that the laity are

men, and that they are responsible for themselves. . . . I feel, therefore, that so far from the Church of England suffering in any way from any amount of education that can be given to the people, it is the very condition upon which alone we can do our work well; for we can only do our work well when those who listen to us are able to understand what we say. . . . We cannot do better service to the Church of England than by encouraging, in every possible way, the education of the people from the very highest to the lowest ranks of society.¹

Education, in the Bishop's view, was the right policy of the Church of England, and it was the best gift which the Commonwealth could bestow in order to promote individual progress. This conviction underlay the earnestness with which he advocated a system of exhibitions awarded on proof of capacity, in preference to educational system based on patronage. It was his interest to be very guarded in his utterances on his first entrance to the diocese, but nothing will keep him from speaking out his mind on this subject, and very soon he is found trying conclusions about it with Dean Boyd at a public meeting:—

The Bishop said he wished to say a few words at this point, because otherwise it might seem as if he were willing to admit in some degree the force of what had been said by the Dean, whereas he thought, after having certainly studied the subject a great deal, that the conclusions at which the Dean had arrived were in reality inconsistent with the real interests of the poorer classes of the city. To lay the stress which the Dean did upon the maintenance of old foundations as such was inconsistent with the best interests of those foundations, and with the truest regard for the wishes of the founders of them. If the changes appeared to him in any degree whatever to interfere with the true interests of the poor he should be the very last man in the world to support them. But he believed some such reconstruction as was proposed was a change that was really necessary in order to give the poor the full benefit of the institutions.²

¹ *Exeter and Plymouth Gazette*, December 9, 1870.

² Meeting of City Committee at Guildhall *re* Endowed Schools Commissioners' Scheme, January 29, 1872.

I. In this large-hearted and progressive spirit Bishop Temple approached the general question, applying his principles to the specific problems connected with primary and secondary education now presented to him. It was necessary to deal first with the latter, as the Commissioners were already in the county. Devon is comparatively rich in educational endowments. They were to be found all over the county, and were specially plentiful in the Cathedral City. The two most noteworthy owe their origin to former Bishops of Exeter. (1) The Episcopal Schools were founded by Bishop Ofspring Blackall at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and at the time when Bishop Temple came into the diocese were used as Primary Schools for boys and girls. (2) The Grammar School had a twofold origin. The first founders had been Bishops Stapeldon and Grandisson,¹ who had attached it to the Hospital of S. John, an existing institution in the city of Exeter, established by a citizen of Exeter for poor men and women some hundred years before Stapeldon's time. The Hospital was suppressed at the Reformation, but the Grammar School was re-founded at a later date under a Charter of Charles I. An orphanage was attached to it, being part of the original foundation of the hospital, and an English School. Round this composite Foundation the Commissioners grouped two other endowments known as Hele's Charity and Maynard's Charity, forming out of them one united Trust (S. John's Hospital Trust).

No little contention arose about the proposals of the Commissioners. It had reference both to their main principle, which was the allocation of a substantial portion of the endowments to secondary education; and also to the details, viz.—(1) The

¹ *Supra*, "Exeter" Memoir, p. 260.

substitution of the system of exhibitions for nomination by patronage; (2) the assignment of a considerable share in the endowments to the education of girls; (3) the infusion of a county element into the constitution of the Grammar School.

On all these points Bishop Temple contended for the larger view, as will be seen from the following letter¹ which he addressed to the Mayor of the city:—

THE PALACE, *February 5, 1872.*

MY DEAR MR. MAYOR.—. . . I wish to take this opportunity of trying to put the proposals of the Commissioners in a brief, clear form, and to express my opinion on them in detail.

The Commissioners propose to reorganise the endowments in such a way as to provide a complete system of schools from the lowest to the highest.

They assume that Elementary Schools will be provided under the Education Act. And there is no reason to doubt that, after a little while, this part of the educational system will be as efficient as the careful control of the citizens and the supervision of the Government can make it.

The grade of education next above, it is proposed to supply out of the Episcopal Charity and Maynard's Charity.

The Episcopal Charity is to build an elementary school in connexion with the Training College. This school, while an elementary school within the meaning of the Education Act, would be not only the practising but the model school of the Training College, where the students could watch and study the best methods of teaching, but not be themselves ordinarily employed as teachers. The fees would be between 6d. and 9d. a week. It would thus stand midway between the ordinary elementary schools and the schools of the Third Grade. A certain number of selected children from the elementary schools might be admitted either free or at lower terms, and their fees either partially or wholly paid for them.

The schools of the third grade would be held in the present building of the Episcopal Charity Schools. The fees would be between £2 and £4 a year. For the present boys

¹ This letter is incorporated in the Report of the Endowed Schools Commission, 1882.

and girls would be taught in different parts of these schools. Hereafter, when the schools had grown (as they are sure to do), the girls would have school-rooms of their own, supplied, or partly supplied, out of Maynard's Charity.

The second grade of education would be given, as proposed by the City Committee, at Hele's School.

The highest grade would be given by the Foundation which includes the S. John's Hospital and the Grammar School. It is important to notice that this is but one Foundation, and that from its origin both the purposes which it now professes to fulfil were contemplated, and, moreover, that the amount of the property to be assigned to either purpose is not to be determined by anything in the original instrument, but simply by usage. The Grammar School, as a matter of fact, has been almost ruined, in spite of laborious headmasters, by the small amount assigned to it, and this merely because an arrangement had come into force which no one was willing to disturb.

It is proposed to assign to the purpose of higher education a much larger share of this joint Endowment, and to give girls a portion of it as well as boys. To make the education complete and thorough this is absolutely necessary; and as the Indenture of 1629 (the starting-point of the present Foundation) in more than one place speaks of the good of the city and the inhabitants thereof as part of the general aim, it is certainly no real departure from the original purpose to make such a rearrangement of the revenues as the general good requires. No argument is needed to show how sorely Exeter suffers from the want of a good Grammar School for boys and of a good Upper School for girls. The wealthier can, of course, provide for themselves. They can send both sons and daughters to a distance. But the great body of the middle class, who will be now for the first time rated, and perhaps heavily rated, for Elementary Schools, have no really efficient schools for their own children. And although it seems to be thought that there is something especially incongruous in providing an Upper School for girls, I cannot see how it is to be maintained that the middle classes, from the shop-keepers upwards, do not need efficient schooling for their girls as well as for their boys, nor how provision for it is inconsistent with the purpose of a Foundation which aims at the good of the citizens generally. Our ancestors, to whom we owe this Foundation, were wise men. They gave to their upper education the completeness, and to their lower educa-

tion the form that suited their day. We must do the same, or else, though we may mimic their acts, we shall not copy the example of their wisdom.

The working of these schools should be this : each school would be attended by the children of those parents who could afford to pay the fees. But children selected by merit from the Elementary Schools would be admitted free into Third Grade Schools, and children selected by merit from the Third Grade Schools would be admitted free into Second and First Grade Schools. Thus a child even of the poorest parents might rise by his merits as far as his powers would fit him to rise. This would be done by means of the Exhibitions.

Less is said in detail about Exhibitions in the Memorandum sent to us than the subject deserves, and this for an obvious reason. It is not possible to estimate beforehand the nature and amount of the Exhibitions that will best suit the educational needs of the place. It is therefore usual in all good schemes of schools to leave the Governors a great latitude of discretion in dealing with the Exhibition Fund.

But it is possible to indicate the form which these Exhibitions will probably assume.

The spare money of the Episcopal Charity will probably be best used in providing means by which children from the Elementary Schools may be brought into the schools of the Third Grade either at low fees or free, or even with a small amount of money in hand over and above the fees to compensate them for not beginning at once to earn wages. Besides these Exhibitions for children from Elementary Schools there must be also provided from this fund Exhibitions to enable selected scholars in the Third Grade Schools to go to the schools of a higher grade. If this be not provided, the Third Grade Schools will languish for want of the stimulus which these Exhibitions alone can give.

The remaining income of the Foundation, which now includes S. John's Hospital and the Grammar School, ought to be used chiefly to fulfil a purpose which was once fulfilled by every Grammar School in the country, and which the inevitable change in the nature of modern education has rendered it impossible for them to fulfil any longer.

It was once the case (and it would not be necessary to go very far back in the history of Exeter to find instances of it here) that a poor boy might, and often did, find at the Grammar School near his home the means of rising to high

distinction, and of doing honour to his school and to his town by his after-life. By diligent use of the faculties that God had given him, without being beholden to anybody, the poor lad could attain the aims of an honourable ambition. And the perpetual recurrence of the phrase in hundreds of Foundation Deeds, that it was intended that poor boys might be brought up to serve God in Church and State, shows how much the idea of making this possible prevailed in the minds of those who founded the schools.

This the poor have now lost, not because any one has purposely taken it away, but because the old system of Grammar Schools has perished and cannot be revived. It is a boon better worth restoring than any other that can be given, and one which I believe the founders had more closely at their hearts.

I do not much like the form of the proposal in this matter submitted to our consideration by the Commissioners. It is matter of much doubt whether the twenty Exhibitions will be the best mode of using the money. And I should prefer to leave the actual apportionment of the money to the discretion of the governing body, under the restraint of one simple rule, viz. that it should be used to enable, not poor children, but children who had been educated in the public Elementary Schools of the Parliamentary Borough of Exeter to carry on their education further, in proportion as they showed such diligence and capacity as to be likely to profit by doing so.

Now this scheme of exhibitions is objected to as a robbery of the poor, and more particularly because it proposes no longer to maintain S. John's Hospital on its present footing.

How it is possible for thoughtful men to believe that an educational system for the whole city which provides that every poor boy, if he have diligence and capacity to profit by the boon, shall have the means of using that system from one end to the other is not preferable to the maintenance and instruction of twenty-five poor children, it is difficult for one to understand.

Consider what benefit the Hospital now confers. We bring a child in and give it a great boon. But meanwhile what have we done for those we left outside? Is there any single soul the better besides this child and the relations that are no longer burthened with it? The sum total of the benefit is that, out of this large city, you have taken care of twenty-five children. On the other hand, the scheme

of the Commissioners says to every God-fearing father and to every careful mother that the pains taken to bring their child up well, to see that it is regular in its attendance at school, to see that it is diligent, attentive, and obedient, to encourage it in its learning, to see that the home life does not undo school lessons,—these make the most likely road to immediate and visible success, a success earned and not solicited, a success which is an honour to both parents and child.

It is argued that such benefits are confined to clever children. It is true that where God has given special fitness for higher learning to any child, however poor, this scheme recognises the claim (it seems to me an exceedingly strong claim) of that special fitness. But it is a mistake to suppose that this, and this alone, will decide all such competitions. Diligence, regularity, attentiveness, will tell most heavily, and in these points almost everything depends on the homes in which the children live and the parents to whom those homes belong.

It is no slight blessing to the poor that a scheme of education should improve every Elementary School with the powerful stimulus of hope. Our Elementary Schools at present are often well taught, well managed, well examined; but they are all alike deficient in that brightness and life which hope alone can give. There is no aim set before the learners which they can easily appreciate. There is little encouragement to the parents. While all other classes of society are eager for improved education, for the poor and the poor alone we are driven to use compulsion. And why? Chiefly, you may be sure, because every other kind of school offers rewards in plenty, and the Elementary School offers none.

Nor is it a small matter to set the poor absolutely free in this matter from all need of soliciting trustees or patrons. Who can measure the mischief which such solicitation causes, or the many occasions on which the wrong choice is made on such a system? The Trustees may do their best, and yet on any system which makes them the dispensers of patronage it must constantly happen that the most deserving cases are passed by in consequence of their own desert. The poor widow who is so unselfish as to always fancy that her neighbour is in greater need than herself, the poor widow who thinks it a duty never to ask for help if she can possibly provide for her own by her own exertions,—these are constantly and inevitably overlooked even by the most

careful trustees, and the boon is obtained by the importunate and plausible.

You may be sure, Mr. Mayor, that all boons given to the poor are multiplied tenfold in value if they are given in such a form as to recognise the poor man as a fellow-citizen among citizens, and not as belonging to a class apart. . . . I would wish the poor man to get what can be given him out of these Endowments, not because he is poor, but because he is a citizen of Exeter—not because he has begged for it, but because he has fairly won it—with no sense of humiliation, but with that honest satisfaction which attends the success of conscientious labour. And I have that opinion of my poorer fellow-citizens, that I feel confident that if they thoroughly understood the alternative, they would much prefer a scheme which recognised their place in the whole body, and duly provided for what belonged to that place, to one which set them apart to receive a favour conferred on a few by the award of personal patronage.

This is the most important question now in dispute. But there is another of less importance which deserves a very few words. It is proposed to treat the Grammar School as not only an Exeter, but also a County School, and to put it for that reason to a great extent under County management. It is obvious that Exeter may be considered in two respects, either as an ordinary town of 40,000 inhabitants, or as the County town of Devon, and the Cathedral City of both Devon and Cornwall. In dealing with the Grammar School, it is proposed to consider Exeter in the latter capacity, and in that capacity, if it holds eight places out of twenty on the Governing Body, it certainly has no reason to complain. Now I do not think it at all unnatural that it should appear at first sight as if there were no reason for this, and as if the school ought to be treated as simply an Exeter School. But on the other hand, it is to be remembered that it is for the interest of the school itself to hold County rank. The difference which this makes in the position of the Headmaster is very considerable, and you will assuredly attract much abler men to take charge of the school if that rank is given to it. The whole difference between a truly great and a very poor school will depend on the sort of men you put at the head. Men of learning and ability are often keenly alive to the dignity of the position which they are asked to occupy, and to make the school a County School will greatly increase its chances of thorough efficiency.

In conclusion, Mr. Mayor, let me express a little regret that the reorganisation of our Endowments should have been made, as I see that it has been made, in some degree, a party question. It is not really a party question at all. The supreme consideration is the good of the whole city, and especially of our poorer fellow-citizens as citizens of the city, and though it is natural that, till the matter is closely studied, party predilections should enter, they cannot remain if we examine deeply. Both sides have really one aim. I believe that both sides, if they had time to look into all the evidence, would come to one conclusion. For I remember the extreme divergence of views in the Schools' Inquiry Commission when it first met. And yet in the end we never had one difference of opinion on what we should recommend. I cannot help hoping that here, too, the longer we reflect, the more we shall tend to unanimity.—I have the honour to remain, yours very faithfully,

F. EXON.

The Right Worshipful the Mayor of Exeter.

Eventually the schemes were adopted in such a form as to include all the main points for which Bishop Temple had contended.

1. The endowments were so reorganised as to supply a complete system of secondary education in all its grades, both for boys and girls. Adequate provision was thus made for the education of the professional and commercial classes, whilst a system of exhibitions, furnishing a ladder by which the poorest citizen might rise to whatever level his natural faculties entitled him, extended the benefits to the wage-earning classes. Regard was also paid to the interests of these classes by providing certain Elementary Schools of a somewhat superior grade, paving the way for those which are now known as Higher Elementary Schools.

2. Two good schools were established for the secondary education of girls, viz. : a High School and a Middle School.

3. Occasion was taken to plant out the Grammar

School away from the city, and to give it increasingly the character of an English Public School.

4. The special character impressed upon schools of ecclesiastical origin and history, or episcopal connexion, was respected, provision being made that, subject to a conscience clause for day-scholars, the religious instruction given in them should be in accordance with the doctrines of the Church of England.¹ In all other cases the religious instruction was to be regulated by the Governors and the head teachers, subject to the same limitation.

5. The constitution of the Governing Bodies was enlarged, so as to include in one case both civic and county elements, and in another representatives as such of the clergy of the city.

In brief, the scheme fully justifies the conclusion in which a member of a later Royal Commission summed up the situation thirty years later—"The whole scheme has got Frederick Temple written over it very large."²

It has been thought well to describe the Exeter scheme in detail, because it indicates the general line of Bishop Temple's action in Secondary Education, and was followed with the necessary adjustment to local circumstances, both at Plymouth, where he was largely instrumental in founding Secondary Schools both for boys and girls, and elsewhere in the diocese.

II. In dealing with elementary education, Bishop

¹ The schools where this provision obtains are: the Grammar School, the Schools (Elementary and Secondary) of the Episcopal Trust, and the Elementary School attached to S. John's Hospital.

² The latest testimony to Bishop Temple's work is contained in a "Report on the Secondary and Higher Education in Exeter," recently issued by Professor Sadler: "In the Spring Term of 1904 there were more boys and girls, per 1000 of the population, receiving education in public and private secondary schools in Exeter than, so far as is at present known, in any city in this country. This is due, in no small measure, to the educational improvements which were carried out in Exeter about thirty years ago, largely under the influence of Dr. Temple, who was then Bishop of the Diocese."

Temple was on ground as familiar to him as that which he occupied while handling secondary, and the opportunity was even more favourable. As has been stated, he entered upon his diocese at the very time when Mr. Forster's Bill of 1870 was being contested in Parliament. Mr. Forster was an intimate friend, and had, moreover, great confidence in the soundness of Dr. Temple's judgment, and the Bishop was probably consulted both as to the original provisions of the Bill, and also as to the amendments which after its introduction it became necessary to insert. Bishop Temple, with his natural instinct for breadth of treatment and elasticity of action, liked the Bill best in its original form, which allowed Rate Aid to be granted to Voluntary Schools, and left with School Boards the responsibility of deciding what the form of religious instruction in the schools which they established should be. His whole mind was in the direction of making the system as favourable as possible to religious freedom, and specially of emphasising the responsibility both of parents and teachers. In regard to the responsibility of parents he says :—

It was a very serious thing indeed to interfere with the responsibility of the parent. After all the child was, by God's providence, put into the parents' hands; they were responsible for feeding and clothing it, and so they must also be for teaching and educating it. The fifth commandment seemed to him plainly to imply that no other authority could interfere between the child and the parent, except the neglect was such as to amount to a crime. Certainly no authority had a right to compel a parent to give to a child, in any degree whatever, religious instruction of which the parent disapproved.¹

He expresses his views as to the obligation of the teacher with equal force :—

¹ Address at South Molton. *Exeter and Plymouth Gazette*, March 1870.

He thought for himself that the thing that was most worth fighting for was that religious instruction should be given by the schoolmasters—that was in reality the distinction between a religious and a secular school. . . . He thought that when the schoolmaster was required to give religious instruction, it was almost inevitable that he should leaven all that he said with something of a religious cast, and if he was a man of any real conviction it was quite certain that his religious feelings would show themselves at all hours of the day. He thought, on the contrary, that if a schoolmaster did not give religious instruction, there was a very serious risk that the tone of the school would very much go down, that the schoolmaster himself would very rapidly become a different sort of a man—not the kind of man he should like to see in charge of a school for elementary instruction.¹

In giving religious instruction he wished that the teacher should be unfettered, but he accepted the Cowper-Temple clause, interpreting it in the sense that, while it forbade the use of exclusive formularies (which was a flying of battle-flags), it was not meant to tie the hands of teachers with regard to truths that lay behind the formularies. It is in accordance with this general view that he speaks in the following words :—

He thought, on the whole it would be wiser to accept a compromise, and be content in the rate-supported schools with having the Bible as the book for religious instruction. He confessed that he did not quite agree with — in thinking that they ought not to contend very earnestly against the mere reading of the Bible. . . . He did not question that the mere reading of the Bible was a very good thing for the child—a very good thing—but he did not think that it was enough for the schoolmaster. He wanted the schoolmaster as part of his work, if possible, to put his mind to the religious instruction—and not merely to hear the Bible read for its own sake.²

It follows from his desire that both parent

¹ Speech at the Exeter Diocesan Board of Education, April 1870.

² *Ibid.*

and teacher should be unfettered that he was not a friend of the Cowper-Temple clause as it was eventually worked. It became to him the symbol of a compulsory undenominationalism which fettered religious freedom, while it offered no security that religious instruction would be given by men who believed the things that they taught, or that it would be true to the essentials of Christianity.

When the Act was passed, he accepted it loyally, and set to work with the utmost earnestness to bring the schools of the diocese up to its requirements. Many of the clergy and not a few of the Church laity had worked hard for the education of the poor, and the parish school was a witness to their self-sacrificing efforts. In some cases the educational level itself was good, and almost always the schools had for long been an influence on the side of good manners and moral and religious training. But, speaking generally, they were hardly up even to the standard of five-and-thirty years ago. The good dames who kept many of them were, to say the least, not advanced scholars. "You must not go beyond seven times eight," said one of them, when a member of a school board, full of zeal, intruded into her domain, and paid a friendly visit of surprise, "for I am not sure that I can go further myself." The Bishop soon realised the lack of knowledge :—

I have been lately engaged in holding Confirmations throughout the diocese (he said during the course of his first tour), and I assure you that I have been struck, and often most deeply struck, when I had to speak to the young people who were presented to me for that ordinance. When watching their faces I could not help noticing every now and then the puzzled expression, even on the faces of those who were evidently doing their very utmost to follow what I was saying, which seemed to imply that they could not understand the very simplest language that I was using. And yet

they had been most carefully prepared, and might fairly be expected to represent some of the most educated of those who were to be found in the different parishes which I visited. And the more I see of the poor, the more I feel that the task before us is very great indeed.¹

The buildings were often as primitive as the instruction was scanty. Moreover, neither clergyman nor squire was always eager in the cause, and dissent, prevalent both in Devon and Cornwall, hindered the establishment of Church Schools. The Diocesan Board had been established under Bishop Phillpotts, and a training school had been built for masters at Exeter and for mistresses at Truro. There was also a system of voluntary inspection of religious knowledge, and some of the leading laymen of the diocese, as well as prominent clergymen, had enrolled themselves as inspectors, the late Sir Thomas Dyke Acland amongst the number. Individuals were deeply interested, but the diocese, as a whole, had not been reached: Bishop Temple determined to reach it.

The first step necessary was to ascertain the facts. The Bishop set a committee to work, among the most prominent members of which was a late opponent, the Rev. Henry Bramley, throughout his life a staunch and zealous friend of education, and fervent in every good endeavour. The former opponent became the loyal friend. It was a case of love at first sight. The clergy of the city, with Bramley as Rural Dean at their head, had presented an address of formal welcome to the new Bishop on the day of his enthronement, and his bearing, both then and at a Confirmation^a at the Cathedral which followed shortly afterwards, and his direct and fervent words, had begun to make the disciple. "Why! the Bishop stood all the time he was confirming

¹ Education Meeting in the Royal Public Rooms, Exeter, June 1870.

that great mass of candidates, and he never moved a foot the whole hour. It was a sight to watch his face too! I never saw such a man!" Fellowship in a work to which each was devoted completed the conquest. Henceforward Bramley was one of the Bishop's right-hand men; and there was something touching in the simple and homely ministry—such as the supply of Devonshire produce from his garden and parish—with which he followed him after he had left Exeter. On the first Education Inquiry Bramley's industry and business capacity were invaluable. As a result of exhaustive inquiry throughout the diocese, it was found that several thousand pounds must at once be spent on school buildings. Bishop Temple saw from the first the importance of securing the buildings, even if eventually they could not be permanently retained as Church day schools. His words have their lesson for the present time:—

I think that in any parish in which the rate-supported system is introduced it would be a very serious deduction from the clergyman's power of doing his work if he had no building at command which he could use as a Sunday School, or for similar purposes of religious instruction. It may be that in many cases the holders of school buildings will find it necessary to transfer them to School Boards to be supported, but in all such cases the Act allows bargains to be made with the School Boards. I need not point out how very much better a position the clergyman will be in if he is able to say, "Here is a school building which is available for the purposes of elementary education, and under the present circumstances I am willing that it shall be maintained by the rates; but in consideration that you are saved the expense of putting up a building, and have only to maintain the school in it, I should wish to make some arrangement for the use of it when you are not actually using it."¹

Ideas are slow to filter through in Devonshire, and action is somewhat leisurely; but in this case

¹ Meeting of Exeter Diocesan Education Board, Sept. 1870.

it was absolutely necessary that the pace should be quickened, as the Act provided that the building grants of Government should only continue for one year more. With his usual directness of action the Bishop went, with the figures supplied by the committee in his hand, and announced—"This is a big matter and we must move at once: I will give £500, what will you give?" An eye-witness has described the scene. The great men of the diocese hesitated for a moment; they were not quite prepared for this man's quick ways and large modes of action, and if this was the beginning what would follow? One or two retired into corners of the room to confer; they looked puzzled and whispered together, "What does it mean"? To Bishop Temple, who was personally too generous to be ever a rich man, the actual sum meant a good deal; and many years afterwards he said with a kind of rueful playfulness, "Oh yes, I know those Devonshire schools; they cost me £500 to start with, and I haven't got over that yet." But in his judgment the matter was worth more than any financial sacrifice. He accepted the Board School system; and with his political antecedents, it might have been expected that he would have been content with it; but he never divorced his liberalism from his religion, and with habitual foresight he saw that religious education would not be safe if the Board School system stood alone. It was meant, as Mr. Forster said, "to supplement and not to supersede"; and even if the supplemental agency were one day to become the main agency, the Voluntary Schools would still be needed to stimulate and sustain the religious element in the Board Schools; without the former, in the latter religious interest would die, religious instruction would be "crowded out" by the pressure of the secular work. Voluntary Schools

were the security that in the training of the young religion would hold the supreme place.

Accordingly, from the outset of his episcopate Bishop Temple stood forward as the champion of Voluntary Schools. In response to his strong lead interest was stirred in the cause as it had never been stirred before. Meetings were held throughout the diocese; he enlisted support from all—laymen as well as clergymen, cathedral dignitaries as well as parish priests, landowners and farmers, the dwellers alike in large towns and in small and scattered villages. All were drawn by the impulse and contagion, but his was the guiding and animating spirit. The immediate response was a sum exceeding £5000—sufficient, when supplemented by the Government Building Grants and by local subscriptions, for the building, enlargement, or equipment of many hundred schools. But the chief gain of the movement lay in its permanent effect; it was at once the revelation of a latent determination on the part of the Church and also a perpetual inspiration to it. The greatness of the result was a surprise even to Bishop Temple himself.

I have no doubt (he said to his Diocesan Board immediately after the passing of the Act in 1870) that the great majority of boroughs all over England will prefer to rate themselves, and probably to rate themselves very speedily. I think it is almost certain that it will be impossible to maintain the voluntary principle in the boroughs very long. But besides the boroughs there are reasons for thinking that, even in many of the smaller towns and country parishes, the rate-supported system will take the place of the voluntary.¹

The fact that, when he left Exeter fifteen years later, the Voluntary Schools of the diocese were stronger and more numerous than when he came to it, and that the legacy of his spirit remained after he left Exeter, is due to the force of his first utter-

¹ *Exeter and Plymouth Gazette*, September 23, 1870.

ances, and the dogged pertinacity with which, in and out of season, he followed them up. These told not only upon the clergy, but upon a mass of serious laymen of moderate views, and brought conviction to them, that in maintaining Church Schools they were not contending for a sectional cause, but were supporting religion itself. Bishop Temple leavened a diocese and two counties with a great belief. And the work revealed his character; it showed his sense of the proportion of things; it was made plain that here was a man not of views and schemes, but one whose heart was set on the great issues of life. To secure that the future of the country should be a Christian future would be the great aim of him whose faith had been doubted.

It has been held that in his later years Dr. Temple swerved from the boldness and robust liberality of his early educational policy. That there were changes no one will deny, but from the first he had claimed the right to modify his policy. And he did change in details. In the sanguine hopefulness and the strong individuality of the first days of his Episcopate he had not perceived that a system which had worked well at Rugby, when controlled by himself, could scarcely be made the basis of a religious settlement under the conditions of party government; he protested, indeed, against the party handling of the education question from the very first, but the system was too strong for him, and he has been heard to sigh in old age because some of the early visions could not practically be realised. But he did not change in principle. If he seemed to change, it was because the position of the combatants had been reversed; it was Churchmen who now stood for freedom for parent and teacher, and Nonconformists who opposed it. To the very last he held to the essentials of his early faith. Still, to the very last he was true to the purpose which he

had set before his own Grammar School at Exeter—the school which had come down to him from his predecessor, Bishop Stapeldon :—

We are bound to aim high. We are bound to think of the school, not only as the place where the understanding is to be cultivated, but as a place where the principles on which the life shall be hereafter regulated are to be stamped upon the soul.¹

For half a century he was a prominent figure in educational work. And his last speech in the House of Lords recalls the man who, by the force and tone of his educational policy, had, more than thirty years before, brought home to a doubting diocese the conviction that he had the moral claim to be their Bishop.

¹ Exeter Grammar School Anniversary. Sermon by the Bishop in Exeter Cathedral, February 3, 1870.

CHAPTER V

DIOCESAN ORGANISATION

The principle of self-government—Rural Deaneries—Lay Conferences—Archdeaconries—Central Diocesan unity—Formation, constitution, and aims of the Diocesan Conference—Primary session of the Diocesan Conference—Formation of the General Committee of Religious Instruction.

THE new Bishop did wisely in making his first approach to his diocese on the personal and more human side. The diocese needed organisation. Shortly after Dr. Temple's appointment as Bishop had been announced, one of the Devonshire clergy who knew the diocese well, had written :—

Some of us who have known the ins and outs of things during the last twelve years, when "every man has done what was right in his own eyes," are half-amused as well as vexed at the opposition. . . . You may imagine the state we have been in when I tell you that I have not sent in any answers to the Episcopal Queries for twelve years. A Cornish clergyman laughed at me for doing so, when I first came into the diocese, and assured me that the Returns were used for waste paper. I thought I would prove this for myself as far as I could, and left off making them . . . I received a Circular to remind me that I was a delinquent. I went down . . . prepared to meet the charge, but not a word was said to me.¹

Dr. Temple was a great organiser. But organisation is a means and not an end ; it regulates life,

¹ Letter from a Devonshire clergyman to Dr. Temple, October 15, 1869.

but it does not create it; it is machinery at the best, and if the machinery is to work well, some confidence in the maker of it is required. These considerations were never absent from Bishop Temple's mind, and the visits preceded the organisation.

Moreover, while Bishop Temple believed in organisation, the framer of an ambitious scheme would often be met with the criticism, "You've overdone your organisation; it won't work." As being in the nature of things indifferent, it was not an essential consideration with him whether the organisation were old or new; if life were still in it he preferred the old, and if life had fled, he unhesitatingly adopted new; but it was essential that it should be adapted to its purpose, and that there should not be too much of it.

And he chose the organisation which contained the principle of self-government; it was the guiding principle through all his liberalism in politics. He harps upon this string in his letters to his friends. Writing to Dr. Benson in 1868 he says:—

The aim of the Conservatives is good government. All forms and all legislatures are machinery to secure that. That in their eyes is the best Constitution which secures the best Government.

The aim of the Liberals is self-government. All forms and all legislatures are machinery to secure that. That is the best Constitution which most entirely makes the people govern themselves.

It is, in politics, the ancient quarrel between the Law and the Gospel. It is, *mutatis mutandis*, the battle between the Judaisers and S. Paul.

The Conservatives repeat for ever all the Judaising arguments. What advantage, then, hath the Englishman? Do you not make void the Law? Will you not go clean wrong that your liberty may have its full swing, *i.e.* abound?

In vain do we urge that our great examples in past days (like Abraham and David) were great in their *development* if not in their *obedience* to the Constitution. In vain do we

insist that our "trust in the people" is the one only chance of making the people what they ought to be. S. Paul must have been very hard pressed when his dear Corinthians turned his "All things are lawful for me" into a reason why a man should take his father's wife. But he did not flinch for all that. And if we find that the result of trusting the people is that the people go wrong, we shall trust the people, nevertheless, and maintain that it is right to do so.

Now I do not deny that the Conservatives have a part to play. But I maintain that, as a rule, they enormously overdo it, even for their own purposes. And we Liberals are barely able to secure that the nation shall retain its life and not be drilled out of all true life . . . If we get no better Parliament than before, yet the gain is enormous of having brought so many more into the active living part of the nation, of having added so vastly to the national form of the Legislature.

Now, after you have read this, as I know you have been studying the Epistle to the Romans, I expect to receive a recantation of all your Conservatism, and a promise to be a steady Liberal henceforward.

I am glad my godson is dreamy. I was and am very dreamy.—Yours affectionately, F. TEMPLE.

In the following year he writes again :—

I differ from you to the very utmost length of my small intellectual tether about good government and self-government. I think . . . that self-government is the true aim, or otherwise government is not worth attempting at all.

He uses the same argument in a letter addressed to the *Daily News* about the same time, *i.e.* the years in which Mr. Robert Lowe was making powerful speeches in Parliament against the lowering of the franchise :—

In politics (said Dr. Temple) the aim is not an *ἔργον*, but an *ἐνέργεια*—not a result, but an activity. The supreme consideration is not what you do, but how you do it. That State is the most healthy in which the life passes through the whole Body.

He desired to apply the principle of self-government to things ecclesiastical, as far as was

consistent with the consideration that life for the Church comes not from beneath but from above ; and accordingly, in organising the Diocese of Exeter, it rejoiced him to find, ready to his hand, a system illustrating that principle. In order that Church life might be sufficiently diffused throughout the diocese he started with the ruridecanal system as the unit in the diocesan organisation, and in the Diocese of Exeter he found that system already based on his favourite principle : the clergy elected their own rural deans. This had been the method followed by Bishop Phillpotts when, as stated above,¹ he had revived the Chapter Synods. He had found it already established as an ancient use, and although it is said that he wished to substitute for it Episcopal nomination, he yielded to the manifest unwillingness of the clergy to part with a cherished privilege. The machinery was used by Bishop Temple for administrative rather than for doctrinal purposes. The application was changed, but the principle was welcomed, and was adopted by Dr. Temple not only at Exeter, but subsequently in the Dioceses both of London and Canterbury. The method has much to commend it. There is no doubt that under this system the best man is not always secured for the office. There may be some local use directing that the senior incumbent is always to be taken ; personal preference may also sometimes have more weight than public interests. No system, however, is free from the latter possibility ; and on the whole, so long as the Bishop, by holding the appointment of the Archdeacons in his own hands, was secure that one set of diocesan officers would represent his mind, he thought it better, for the appointment of the rural deans, to look to the principle of self-government, and to trust the clergy to choose their own representative. By this means

¹ *Supra*, p. 270.

he was always able to feel the pulse of each locality, and to know whether or not he should carry it with him in any proposed line of action. Experience justified the policy. "I have always held," writes Prebendary Martin, R.D., "that it is our election by the clergy themselves which gives us the peculiar position and influence which certainly, as a body, the Rural Deans in our diocese possess."

The first occasion for making use of the rural-decanal system was found in the arrangements for Confirmations. "Make me out a scheme for a Confirmation tour in North Devon," said the Bishop to his chaplain within a few weeks of his coming into the diocese. The chaplain tried his hand, and, being a stranger to Devonshire and the intricacies of its geography, soon failed. "Well, write to Karslake" (one of the rural deans well known for his business capacity and local knowledge); "he will do it." The result was the receipt, in a few days, of a detailed and workable plan which became a sort of model scheme for the diocese. When once the Rural Deans had got this episcopal horseman seated in the saddle there was no shaking him off. Soon the Rural Deans were entrusted, not only with the arrangements for Confirmations, but with the details of a large share of the diocesan business; and, when a few years later the Bishop's chaplain left him, they took his place in accompanying the Bishop on his official visits. Gradually the duties of the Rural Dean were multiplied, and through the decanal system, worked on the principle of self-government, the whole area of the diocese was permeated with renewed life.

But the first Confirmation tour in the diocese was sufficient to make it plain to the Bishop's quick eye for topography that, in order that the system might become more serviceable, a readjust-

ment of boundaries was required. It was made under the authority of an Order in Council, after the advice of the Archdeacons and the local clergy had been taken; and in making it the Bishop, with his usual liking for combining civil and ecclesiastical order, followed for the most part the divisions of the Unions. He grouped the parishes round the towns in which the meetings of the Guardians were held, holding that these would usually be the central towns of the district, and would, moreover, be the places where the attendance of the laity would be most readily secured.

Periodical sessions of the Chapters of the clergy were already held in the majority of the Deaneries; they now became general throughout the diocese, and Bishop Temple infused new life into them by giving a practical turn to the discussions, and by making the Rural Deanery a starting-point for all forms of diocesan activity. He utilised the organisation for his own episcopal visits. His visits in the diocese were not made at haphazard or sporadically¹; he concentrated his attention on one Deanery at a time, arranging, as far as might be, that all the different fixtures should be grouped round the periodical Confirmations. By this means he effected a great saving of time, and accomplished a much greater amount of work than in such a scattered diocese would otherwise have been possible. The most important of all the collective fixtures for the Deanery was his visit to the Chapter. On such occasions he took subjects bearing on clerical or parochial life. Sometimes they were devotional or pastoral, and sometimes legal and administrative. Sometimes he dealt with the lives of the clergy themselves, and sometimes

¹ "I intend to alter my present arrangements, and to visit every Deanery in the diocese once every year."—*Charge of Bishop Temple*, 1875, p. 40.

with the social and moral habits of the community ; sometimes, again, the discussion turned upon matters of general Church interest. In each case, after an earnest and luminous exposition of his own views, he asked the opinions of each of the clergy in turn. This last process was sometimes formidable ; but it had a marvellous effect in stirring, reviving, and spreading life, both collective and individual. Many of the clergy look back on the stimulus given by the Bishop's presence and words at these meetings as the strongest of all impressions which he made upon them. To this day many of them keep, amongst their most treasured records, the notes which they jotted down of his utterances, so pregnant were they with strong common sense, so incisive, so fervent ; they were so great a revelation of the soundness and the wide range of his knowledge on all questions—by no means excepting legal, on which matters he appeared to have as much knowledge as the lawyers themselves and to surpass them in breadth of view. Whatever subject he approached he penetrated to the very kernel ; and as long as the hearer retained what the Bishop said, he felt that he had got the one thing which he most wanted to remember.

But church life and self-government were, in the Bishop's mind, maimed and feeble without the co-operation of the laity. In his early days he had been jealous of the revival of Convocation, fearing clerical monopoly.¹ Experience taught him to modify this view. But Convocation never represented to him the full idea. Thirty-three years afterwards, in 1885, when he was Bishop of London, he writes to Canon Lawson :—

Reforms we ought to make *quam citissime*. I want to abolish the sale of livings, and to form a Church Legislature

¹ *Infra*, p. 556.

with a large infusion of laymen in some shape or other. These two things are pressing, the former because the common people cry out for it; the latter as an instrument for future reforms.

He was always a layman's bishop, and he always believed that lay co-operation, to be a full force, must take root in the locality as well as shape in central assemblies. From the commencement of the Episcopate he had called the laity together into conferences supplemental to the clerical Chapters, and Mr. (afterwards Prebendary) Dumbleton, one of the most earnest of the diocesan clergy, found a ready supporter in his Bishop when he moved, in the Diocesan Conference of 1874, for a more formal institution of lay and clerical Conferences in the Rural Deaneries. At these the churchwardens and representatives chosen by the communicants in each parish met the members of the clerical Chapters. The Bishop attended when he came into the Rural Deaneries, and discussed such subjects affecting the social and moral life of the community as were of interest to the clergy and laity alike. The account of the Bishop's action and influence in the Deaneries may be fittingly closed by the insertion of letters from two of the Rural Deans who best knew their Bishop, and the value of whose long and faithful service he recognised to the full.

FREMINGTON VICARAGE, NORTH DEVON,
May 24, 1904.

I was Rural Dean of Barnstaple the whole period of the late Archbishop's occupancy of the See of Exeter, and possibly I may be able to supply some little interesting material.

First let me mention how greatly nearness to him impressed me with the deep spirituality of his life,—that master-thought continually appearing and fascinating, in

his word and conversation. I may instance a quiet day which he spent with some of us in Holy Trinity Church, Barnstaple, when his instructions, or addresses, on S. John xvii. 19, "For their sakes I sanctify myself," were delivered, while burning tears were coursing down his face, and his whole attitude seemed transformed.

But it was not only the spiritual and serious side of his life which impressed us all so deeply; he was always genial and happy among us when there were no dark spots to pain and disturb his spirit. To mention a circumstance in illustration of this. After the dinner at one of his visitations he proposed the health of the Rural Deans, thanking them for their valuable services and speaking in affectionate terms of them all; "but," he said, "for their work I pay them well—(sensation)—for I give them in return—my smiles." (Great laughter, in which his Lordship joined.)

As a Rural Dean I felt the force of this remark, for I have had both his smiles and his frowns. He was delightful to look upon when surroundings were favourable, but it was quite a different thing when those surroundings were slovenly and confused.

Having attended the Archbishop at many Confirmations up and down the Deanery of Barnstaple, I could not help being struck by the power which he possessed of assessing numbers without counting them¹—for an instance of this. I attended the Bishop at a Confirmation at Ilfracombe in the days of Mr. Chanter, the late Vicar. It was always my custom—to help my memory—to jot down the number of candidates as they came up or as they retired. On one occasion, when called upon in the vestry after the Confirmation for my numbers, the Bishop exclaimed, in no soft voice, "WRONG," for he had one candidate in his mind more than mine on paper. The order then came, "Look at the tickets," the examination of which proved that the Bishop who had not counted was right, and the Rural Dean who had both counted and noted was wrong.

In closing these few remarks may I say that our dear Bishop, though separated by circumstances from his first diocese, never forgot it; and repeated interviews with him with which I was favoured, both at Fulham and Lambeth, gave him opportunities of ascertaining, through question and answer, how matters fared in his old diocese. I cherish his

¹ See also Appendix to "Earlier Years" Memoir, p. 61.

memory with deep affection, and shall ever be grateful for intercourse with so great and good a man.

J. T. PIGOT

(Formerly Rural Dean of Barnstaple).

(*From Rome*), March 25, 1904.

There were numbers of parishes in North Devon where a bishop had never been seen within the memory of man. Take, for instance, the district in which I was then living—(Challacombe). Bishop Phillpotts, no doubt owing to his age and infirmities, limited as far as possible his visits to places which could be easily reached; so that for years all candidates from that large district round Lynton had to be brought, some of them as much as a dozen or fifteen miles by road, to the centre where the Confirmation was held. . . . I perfectly well remember the sensation caused at Challacombe by the arrival of the Bishop there. I remember that he was himself amused when, from the top of Kipscombe, I pointed out Challacombe Church, the centre where the Confirmation was to be held. The moor, as you remember, stretches away for miles, and there is hardly a house to be seen, and I remember the humorous way in which he turned to me and asked, "Well, Martin, what is this the centre of?" I think next day we must have had some thirty or forty candidates altogether, but I have never forgotten that service or the way in which he spoke to the young people of the love of God, while the tears coursed down his cheeks. He never liked having very large numbers at his Confirmations; if there were over seventy he preferred having two Confirmations. . . .

I may also mention an instance which shows his wonderful power, even in the greatest pressure of work, of giving his whole attention to any question that was brought before him. It was two days after he was offered the Bishopric of London. He wrote and asked me to come and see him. We had trouble going on in one of the parishes in my Deanery. I was shown up into his study, and without looking up from his writing, or greeting me in any way, he said, "Sit down." So I took an arm-chair by the fire and made myself comfortable. Presently he put down his pen, saying, "That is the 105th (letter) since yesterday morning." And then he turned round and we talked, I should think, for nearly an hour as if he had nothing whatever else to

do or think of but the subject on which he wanted to talk to me. . . .

One other thing occurs to me which perhaps is worth mentioning. I mean the way in which Bishop Temple made a great point of every parish having, every year, four collections which he suggested should be taken at the Ember seasons—Home Missions, Foreign Missions, Religious Education, and Hospitals. There were, I believe, numbers of parishes which never had any collection for any object outside their own parish, except the annual collection for hospitals. I daresay you remember that he made a great point of these collections, and I believe the plan was very largely adopted, even in the small country parishes. . . .

RICHARD MARTIN
(Rural Dean of Shirwell).

The last sentence in this letter illustrates the practical wisdom by which the Bishop limited his application of large principles to what he knew was the furthest length to which, at the time, they could be taken. He thus alludes to the plan in a pastoral letter to the clergy and laity of the diocese in 1878 :—

The interest of our people in Christian work outside their own parishes is but scanty. But is not this partly due to ignorance of what that work is? And is not that ignorance due to the fact that we take no regular opportunities to set the work before them? Would not this ignorance be much enlightened, if, at one of the four Ember seasons, the clergy made it a rule to give a full account of what the Church is doing for the conversion of the heathen; if, at another, the work of the Church in this country were fully described, such work, for instance, as is done by the Additional Curates' Society, or the Pastoral Aid Society; if, at another, the educational work of the diocese; if, at another, the condition and the needs of our Hospitals and Infirmaries. If, our observance of these seasons consisted merely in putting before our people clear annual accounts of such work as I have indicated, I believe that the gain would be very great; for these are things that it is good for Christians to know.

One of the great hindrances to the reception in

a remote diocese of the full Church idea is local narrowness. Bishop Temple, with all his love for Devon, was well aware of its failings in this respect. A wider outlook was necessary than that supplied by the limited area of the Rural Deanery. The intermediate section between the Deanery and the Diocese, as a whole, was naturally found in the Archdeaconry. The area of the Archdeaconry was sufficiently extended to enlarge scope of thought and action, while not so wide as to endanger the loss of individual service. The Archdeaconries were regarded by Bishop Temple as organic subdivisions of the diocese, and he gave them a recognised share of self-government. Thus, in organising both his educational and his temperance work, he organised it by Archdeaconries, being careful, at the same time, to avoid disintegration of the diocese, by keeping a strong central organisation at Exeter as supreme under himself. In a diocese the size of Exeter, this half-way house between the centre and the boundaries was especially serviceable. The division of the Archdeaconries corresponded with recognised distinctions, both of geography and character. Moreover, it pleased Bishop Temple to make use of an ancient office, and he always availed himself of it, both at Exeter and elsewhere. The experience of the elderly men who held the post of Archdeacon on his entrance upon the western diocese was specially useful to him. Archdeacon Freeman and Bishop Temple stood, in many respects, at opposite poles of thought and character, but the Bishop greatly respected both his learning and his spirituality, and enjoyed his quiet humour. The memory of an evening which they spent beneath the roof of a country parsonage brings back a rich flow of anecdote. "When I first came to Thorverton the farmers had a very poor opinion of me because I

knew so little of farming. 'Parson isn't a bad sort of a man, but he is a very hignorant man.' When I thought about reseating the church an old countryman objected, because the high pews 'be so lew to my pate.'" The Bishop and Archdeacon worked together as friends, and when, a few years afterwards, the latter lost his life through an accident in London, his son recalls how "when his body was laid to rest in Thorverton churchyard, it was Dr. Temple who, bareheaded through the snow, led the great crowd back to the church, and whose strong voice, in thanking God for all who had 'departed this life in His faith and fear,' broke with a great sob, which I think those who heard can hardly have forgotten." Of the other Archdeacons, Woollcombe found much fellowship with his Bishop in exegetical study of the New Testament, and Downall offered him constant hospitality in his beautiful Vicarage at Okehampton, and drove him often across Dartmoor. On one occasion the Archdeacon slipt into the Leat, and the churchwardens, who were met to receive the Bishop and his Archdeacon at the neighbouring village, spread abroad the tale that the two dignitaries had fallen out by the way, and that the Bishop, being the stronger man, had pushed the other into the water. The Archdeacon was a county magistrate, and illustrated the backwardness of the district in education by telling that on going his official rounds as Archdeacon he remonstrated with the Highway Board because there were no signboards, and he had lost his way in consequence. Nothing was done until the Archdeacon was to come that way again, when the authorities set a man to work. But the Archdeacon went more astray than ever. When the delinquent was charged with neglect, he pleaded that he had put up the signposts all right, but, as

he couldn't read, he had planted them in the wrong places. When shortly afterwards the Southern Archdeaconry became vacant, experience had been gained, and the Bishop felt himself at liberty to fill the vacancy by the appointment of a younger man,¹ of whose strenuous activity and loyal services he made full proof, first at Exeter, and afterwards in London.

Yet fuller expression of diocesan life as a whole, and of the principle of self-government, was required, and for this new machinery had to be created. But no man more fully understood the mistake of being in a hurry. Diocesan Conferences were beginning to be "in the air," but the Bishop did not intend to take them because they were in the air. His first step was to take counsel with the Archdeacons and Rural Deans. He then issued a Pastoral to his diocese on the subject, and set to work at the forming of the constitution. It was based upon lines congenial to him. Intended to be the organised expression of the principle of self-government in the diocese, the main feature of the Conference was naturally its representative character. The *ex officio* element was, however, not wanting, and, in accordance with Dr. Temple's constant recognition of the union between Church and State, the lay hierarchy was worked in as well as the clerical, the chief county officers and members of Parliament resident in the diocese being included as members, if otherwise qualified. The laity considerably preponderated in the total number of members. The main features of the Bishop's habitual policy were thus writ large upon the Diocesan Conference, as upon his educational schemes; and to this day, although he ceased to hold jurisdiction in Cornwall nearly thirty years ago, and a new *régime* of more definite ecclesiastical

¹ The Rev. Alfred Earle, "London" Memoir, vol. ii. p. 27.

type has supervened, the prominent position given to the county authorities in the Truro Conference is the survival of an arrangement which obtained when the diocese was as yet undivided and the Conference was held under the auspices and according to the plan of Bishop Temple. A corresponding recognition of existing institutions was also seen in making the churchwardens of the diocese the electorate of the lay representatives. Equal regard was shown to the spiritual character of the assembly; every member was required to be a communicant.

Subsequent alterations have been made, but respect has been paid to the characteristics which Bishop Temple stamped upon the Conference from the first:—(1) the recognition of the principle of self-government; (2) the union between Church and State; (3) the supremacy of the spiritual aim.

His early upbringing amongst simple country people always gave Dr. Temple a natural sympathy with parochial life, and an instinctive appreciation of the kind of proposal which would commend itself to the ordinary parishioner; his advice might be unconventional, and plans, new; but they were never pedantic.

It was not so much the idea of the Diocesan Conference that was new, but the use to which he put it. With an instinctive dislike to talking for talking's sake, he knew also that, after the first novelty had worn off, the laity would not continue to come unless it were evident that the result of discussion was practical effort. One field for increased activity was already open. The need of extending interest in education had been brought closely home by the late Diocesan Inquiry, and, in itself, afforded sufficient occasion for calling the Diocesan Conference together. The result of the Inquiry had made it plain that the diocese, as a

whole, had not yet fully grappled with the subject. Existing agencies had enlisted the warm support of the few, but they had not drawn in the many. It appeared to the Bishop that in setting the Diocesan Conference to work on education, he was doing the best possible thing, both for the one and the other. He therefore suggested a new Diocesan organisation. He proposed that a committee of laymen and clergy should be appointed by the four¹ Archidiaconal sections of the Conference, to act in conjunction with the Cathedral Chapter and the Archdeacons, for the purpose of gaining financial support, and extending educational interest throughout the diocese. It was to be a permanent committee, and was to be called the "General Committee of Religious Instruction." Sub-committees were to be connected with it in each Archdeaconry, and it was agreed to apply the moneys collected by it to three main objects:—

(1) The maintenance of the two diocesan Training Colleges, at Exeter and Truro.

(2) The provision of a system of paid diocesan inspection, rendered necessary by the withdrawal of religious instruction from the cognisance of the Government Inspector.

(3) The furtherance locally, by managers, of religious instruction in the schools of the district.

The inaugural session of the Diocesan Conference was held in the Chapter House on May 28 and 29, 1872. The occasion was notable. Two years and a half before, the new Bishop had hardly gained his footing in the diocese, and suspicion was all around. He had spent the interval in coming face to face with his people, and in that kind of hard work which, when combined with capacity and honesty of purpose, gradually wins

¹ Cornwall had not as yet (1872) been formed into a separate diocese.

confidence. And now he stood surrounded by the chief men of the diocese and county, some of whom had been drawn from estrangement to friendship, and all into a fellowship of work, to expound his cherished principle of self-government, and to illustrate it in that subject, national education, of which he was an acknowledged master, and for the ultimate success of which he had always looked to its ability to enlist the co-operation of the people at large. His conduct of the Conference was an apt example of the combination of strength and good temper which marked his chairmanship, and of quick appreciation of essential points, together with willingness to make concessions in detail, if these were secured. The keynote was given by the Bishop's opening speech :—

He would tell them what seemed to him distinctly to be matters that ought to be excluded from such a Conference as this. . . . He did not think a Conference of this kind was well adapted to discuss matters of doctrine which ought rather to be discussed on paper, and ought to be examined with the slow deliberation which a man gave to what he wrote rather than to what he said. He thought that the only result of attempting to introduce doctrinal questions here would be to cause a very great deal of warm feeling, without that substantial good which alone would justify them in causing that feeling to arise. Again, he thought it of the utmost importance that this Conference should not in any way discuss either the faults of those who belonged to this Conference, or of those who did not. He did not think it would be right that the laity should come there to complain of the clergy, or the clergy of the laity. . . . They could not enforce anything they decided on. All that they could do must be done by agreement, and in no other way; and he thought, therefore, it would be wise from the very beginning to determine that all such questions should be always excluded. . . .

Then what was it that they had met to do? . . . The first subject, and the one which, he confessed, pressed most upon him, was the religious instruction in elementary schools. That seemed to him just at present the most important

matter they could handle, when the State had rather suddenly withdrawn all the support it had given to religious instruction. To use an Americanism, which was very common in their schools, he was very much afraid indeed that unless the Church took the matter up, religious instruction would be "crowded out"—that without any distinct purpose on the part of those who had to do with the schools, the religious instruction would, little by little, get less and less of that attention which was absolutely necessary to make it successful, and that they would find, ten years hence, that, although there was still, perhaps, the legal power of giving that instruction in schools, it had practically disappeared. He thought they ought to handle the matter at once. They would observe that it was not merely that the Government had withdrawn the assistance and encouragement which had hitherto been given, but that, side by side with that withdrawal, there was a great increase of assistance, and a still greater increase of encouragement, to all other instruction. All other instruction now was to be made universal over all the country, and the mere fact of making it universal at once gave it a very much greater importance than before.

Now, this being so very important a subject for them to deal with, he had proposed that they should create a certain machinery for the purpose. There was a machinery already existing, that of the Diocesan Board, which had done a great deal of most admirable work. The management of the Training College, which had been in its hands, had in his opinion been always exceedingly good. The management of the Diocesan Inspection, which had also been in the hands of the Diocesan Board, had been also, he thought, as good as it was possible to make it under the conditions under which that inspection went on. But the Diocesan Board did not seem to him by itself to be sufficient for the work. The diocese as a whole should have the means of expressing its opinion; for this reason he wanted, if possible, to create a representative machinery to work side by side with the Diocesan Board. In the erection of that representative machinery, he proposed in a great degree to follow in the track the Diocesan Board had originally marked out. Those who knew anything of the commencement of that Board were aware that in the beginning there were district Boards as well as a central Board—that there was a local as well as a diocesan organisation. Following that hint he wanted to

create a local as well as a diocesan organisation—the difference being that he wanted it to represent the diocese, and not merely a body of subscribers. Now it was obvious enough that there was some little risk in a proposal of that sort that the organisation created to represent the diocese might not work in perfect harmony with the Diocesan Board. He did not deny the danger, but at the same time he must say that he did not think it so great as to be a serious obstacle to the working of such machinery as he proposed. He would describe to them what he imagined this machinery he proposed would do. The machinery would consist of a general committee of religious instruction—with sub-committees, one for each archdeaconry—which would do its very best to raise the necessary funds. For that purpose he thought it would have very considerable advantages. All those who had anything to do with it would feel that it was a committee which was practically of their own appointing, that it was ultimately responsible to them, and which would have to give an account to them of all it was doing. And he thought people would go along much more heartily with a body of that kind than with any other. Then further, he supposed this general committee would decide first upon these questions—what proportions of the funds raised ought to be given to local objects, and what to diocesan. Local objects would be administered by the Archidiaconal sub-committee, and matters which concerned the diocese at large the general Committee would request the Diocesan Board to deal with. The committee he proposed, not meeting very often, would say to the committee of management of the Diocesan Board—those were the general objects which they, as representing the diocese, wished to be aimed at, and the general principles they wished to be pursued, and they would hand over the money to them with the request that they should manage it on their behalf. It must be remembered that while it was very important to have a general committee to represent the diocese and to carry the sympathies of the diocese with it, it was also quite certain that this administrative work could not be thoroughly well done unless it was by a body that was practically on the spot. They could not very well have a body that was gathered together from a very large surface to be the immediate executive. Of course all this presumed that the committee of the Diocesan Board were willing to accept that position.

He had given them his reasons why he wanted them to create this machinery; he believed that it would carry the diocese along with it much more than any other.

He would give one further reason why he wished very much indeed that such machinery should be set up. He could not help feeling, in dealing with this matter, that it was impossible for the Bishop to forget all through that he was the Bishop of the diocese, and that he had a responsibility as Bishop which only very strong reasons indeed would justify him in shifting on others. Now, if it came to a difference of opinion between himself as Bishop and a Board like the Diocesan Board, he should certainly feel that he ought to be very slow in giving way. He should feel that it was a voluntary association, having no distinct position, and therefore he ought to be quite sure what he was doing before he consented to work with them, when at any conjuncture he felt that they were making a very serious mistake. But the matter would be very different indeed if he felt that his opinion was confronted by the opinion of the whole diocese, or that of a Board which really represented the whole diocese. In many cases, then, he should feel, even if he retained his opinion, quite justified in saying that if he could not carry the diocese with him it would be absurd for him to stand quite alone—it would be like a general walking straight into the enemy's ranks without his army. A bishop without his diocese was nobody, and he might as well be anywhere else.¹

The main point at issue in the discussion which followed was the relation in which the new Committee of Religious Instruction would stand to the existing Diocesan Board. The approved resolutions show the results at which the Conference eventually arrived:—

1. That it is our bounden duty as Churchmen to offer systematic encouragement and aid to Religious Instruction in Elementary Schools and Sunday Schools.

2. That a Committee be appointed to co-operate with the Diocesan Board for this purpose, to be called the General Committee of Religious Instruction, and that it consist of the Dean, the Archdeacons, the Canons Residentiary, and thirty-five elected members, of whom eight Laymen and six

¹ *Exeter and Plymouth Gazette*, May 1872.

Clergymen shall be elected by the representatives of the Archdeaconry of Cornwall, and four Laymen and three Clergymen by the Representatives of each of the Archdeaconries of Devonshire.

3. That the members so elected by each Archdeaconry with their Archdeacon be a Sub-Committee for their own Archdeaconry, and the Sub-Committee for Cornwall have power to divide themselves into two Sub-Committees, one for East and one for West Cornwall, each under the Archdeacon.

4. That each Archidiaconal Sub-Committee be charged to undertake the raising of funds in its own Archdeaconry, and be empowered to administer a certain proportion of the funds so raised under certain rules, the proportion and the rules to be determined by the General Committee.

5. That the General Committee make it their aim, first, to support the Training Schools at Exeter and Truro in full efficiency; secondly, to provide for the payment of Inspectors to report on the Religious Instruction in all Schools to which the Managers are willing to admit them; thirdly, to provide for making grants to Managers on the report of these Inspectors;¹ and the General Committee shall have power to hand over to the Diocesan Board such sums as they shall think fit for these purposes.

6. That the General Committee meet at least once a year at Plymouth, Exeter, Truro, and Barnstaple successively.

7. That the General Committee report annually before Easter to the Bishop, and that the Report be published forthwith, and considered at the next following meeting of the Conference.

It may be well here to quote two letters from the Bishop to Prebendary Sanders, his right-hand man in the diocese on all educational matters. They emphasise, in the Bishop's own trenchant way, the principles which lay behind the foregoing resolutions and his whole course of action in the diocesan settlement:—

May 4, 1872.

MY DEAR MR. SANDERS—I send you the proposed resolutions under the first head. I should like to have them back with your remarks by Monday evening next. You observe

¹ The Fund raised with this threefold object was entitled the Diocesan Religious Instruction Fund.

that hitherto the one English principle has been to make subscribers supreme over the administration of the money subscribed.

Will you let me point out to you that the other principle is the principle of the Church?

The Church's mode is to collect money at an offertory. The money so collected is administered by the clergyman and churchwardens who need not have contributed a penny.

Following that analogy I propose a Committee which is to stand to the diocese as the clergyman and churchwardens stand to the parish.

I think you will see that my plan is thoroughly true to Church principles.

May 7, 1872.

Thank you for your criticism. I shall make some modifications.

But I hold fast to my general principles. I want to make the encouragement and aid of Religious Instruction (as far as I can so make) a diocesan work, and not a work taken up by individuals who combine. I do not want the money to come first and the principles after. I want the diocese to settle the principles and then let the money follow.

If ever there is a collision between the Diocesan Board and the Diocesan Conference, I shall hold by the Conference. The Board has always the possibility (it is inherent in all Voluntary Boards) of being a party organ. The Conference, with its present constitution, can hardly have that character, unless, and in so far as, the diocese has that character.

The true position of the Board is to be the agent of the Conference in administering certain money under rules to be made by the Conference; and if it will not accept that position I do not see any other for it.—Yours affectionately,

F. EXON.

It had been originally intended to discuss matters connected with other branches of the work of the Church in the diocese, but so much interest was excited by the discussion on Education that time failed for this purpose. The same result sometimes followed at succeeding sessions. The Diocesan Conference was held annually during the

Episcopate of Bishop Temple, and subsequent sessions followed the pattern of the inaugural meeting. The General Committee of Religious Instruction has been enlarged in conformity with the representative principle from which it started, and now, under the title of the Diocesan Council of Religious Education, exercises through its special Committees and Associations a general superintendence over all branches of Diocesan Education. These include Secondary and Sunday, as well as Elementary Schools, and the Higher Education of Adults. True to the principle which lay behind the original project, the Conference has been connected with the greater part of the executive agencies of the diocese, and is the source from which, under the bishop, all such organisation flows; it is the spring and centre of collective work.

Two of its earliest products were a system of Diocesan Sunday School Examinations, and the Diocesan Branch of the Church of England Temperance Society. The former of these was the practical outcome of a resolution moved by Mr. Bramley, in the second year of the Conference. The Bishop thought that the first step should be the institution of examinations, and he annually set the papers and looked over the answers himself. There are still Sunday School teachers of the diocese who can show his comments on the manuscripts which, after the papers had been looked over, he always made a point of returning. The work continued after Dr. Temple left Exeter. The Committee has been developed into an Association, and has elaborated plans for which, in the Bishop's judgment, the diocese was not then ripe; but no more suitable foundation for Sunday School service could have been laid than that supplied by the example of Bishop Temple. Few other men would after this fashion have instilled

the true impulse and spirit. The same deliberateness characterised the Bishop in the matter of temperance.¹

It may be that though Bishop Temple believed in the principle of self-government he was sometimes unconscious of the extent to which others leant upon his strong guidance, and that thus self-government had not always the free course which he desired to give it. It may be also that, strongly impressed as he was with the sense that the greater part of the best work must be drudgery, he did not always appreciate that this was hard doctrine for the mass of men, and that there are many, both amongst the clergy and the laity, who, while professing admiration for the practical only, nevertheless "shy at" discussions which are too practical, and prefer "burning questions" to the details of diocesan administration. Such men sometimes voted Diocesan Conferences, under Bishop Temple's régime, a weariness of the flesh. But on the whole it is undoubtedly true that in the constitution of his Conference Dr. Temple cut one of those broad and deep lines which marked all his work and made it permanent. He found a place for his favourite doctrine of self-government in the economy of the Church; he adapted the principle of synodical action to the requirements of modern days; he infused a new vitality into old forms. In fostering and sustaining life in all departments of diocesan work the Conference acquired a special character of its own. It has kept the impress which the founder stamped upon it. Presiding over it, in the absence of the bishop of the diocese twenty years later, Bishop Barry was struck with its special features, as giving a freshness and a reality which reminded him of experiences in a younger community than the Church of England.

¹ *Infra*, p. 482.

In earlier years Dr. Temple had written, "Nowadays Institutions are no longer Habits, as they once were, but Ideas."¹ He was true to his own belief. His organisation was not machinery only, but an expression of life ; as such it aided the growth and progress of the diocese ; and thus it has continuance and is fruitful, and will be the parent of new enterprises when it has done its work and the time for change has come.

¹ Letter to the Rev. R. Lawson, April 27, 1848.

CHAPTER VI

THE REVIVAL OF THE CORNISH SEE

Early history of the Church in Cornwall—United Diocese—First efforts to revive the Cornish Bishopric—Advent of Bishop Temple—His work and residence in Cornwall—Discussion in the Exeter Diocesan Conference—Diocesan Committee and Lady Rolle's gift—Bill for the revival of the Cornish See—Appointment of Dr. Benson—His Consecration and Enthronement—Dr. Temple's Farewell to Cornwall.

THE greatness of Frederick Temple's life was the life itself; but many will think that his greatest piece of work was the revival of the Cornish Bishopric. It was all the greater because the severance from Cornwall which it demanded was an act of self-sacrifice. Bishop Temple was a Cornishman, and the Cornish instinct within him had been powerfully appealed to during his Cornish tours. The hearty reception and the quick response to his earnest words had warmed his Cornish blood. It cost him much to part with Cornwall. The thing had to be done because duty demanded it, but the wrench was severe.

Cornwall and Devon had been placed under one Episcopate before Leofric's time. Cornish life emerges slowly from the region of picturesque legend; but if traditions themselves cannot be relied on, there is, no doubt, a substratum of actual fact beneath. Christianity was probably at home

in Cornwall in the fourth century.¹ The Cornish were Celts, and most of the Christianity was Celtic in its form and usage, and had close links with Ireland, Wales, and Brittany. From Cornwall and the adjoining counties, the last-named province received British Christians fleeing from the Saxon invaders, and from this circumstance acquired its present title in substitution for its old name of Armorica. The south-west of England, under the title of Damnonia, retained its own usages for some time after the departure of the Romans, and the Cornish were the last to part with civil and ecclesiastical independence. It was not until the tenth century that Alfred's son, Edward the Elder, when founding a Bishopric of Devonshire with its centre at Crediton, annexed to it three towns in Cornwall. Previously, Cornwall had enjoyed bishops of its own, who placed their sees apparently sometimes at Bodmin, and sometimes at S. German's and other places. Alfred's grandson, Athelstan, finished what his son had left incomplete; he reduced Cornwall to subjection, and the Cornish were finally incorporated with the English, both civilly and ecclesiastically.² In the reign of Edward the Confessor, as is well known, the seat of the bishop was transferred from Crediton to Exeter, and for more than 800 years (1050-1876) the Diocese of Exeter embraced both Devon and Cornwall.

But perhaps, under the conditions of a united See, the union of hearts was never complete. Differences in race, language, geography, and occupation, constituted a complex and sufficiently stout barrier.

No doubt (says Professor Freeman) from the Axe to the Tamar, and still more from the Parret to the Tamar,

¹ Memorandum contributed by Professor Stubbs to the Truro Diocesan Kalendar, 1895.

² *Ibid.*

the people are still very largely of Welsh descent, though they have spoken English for many ages. In Cornwall itself, . . . the old Welsh tongue went on being spoken for many hundred years; . . . and yet many Englishmen must have settled there, for in the days of Edward the Confessor . . . the greater part of the land of Cornwall was held by men bearing English names.¹

It has been already noticed that in the fourteenth century Bishop Grandisson spoke of Cornwall as a semi-foreign land, and its language as semi-barbaric.² When he preached to the Cornish it was necessary for him to speak by an interpreter, the parson of S. Just-in-Penwith translating his words "in linguam Cornubicam."³ Grandisson's Archdeacon of Cornwall finds, like his chief, a difficulty in the alien tongue, and apparently, not having his robustness of constitution, physical or mental, and being a man well stricken in years, succumbs to the difficulties and resigns his post. "I have never got on well with these Cornish folk," is his pathetic lament, "for they are a truly wonderful race, of a rebellious temper, unwilling to be taught or to submit to correction. A more influential man than myself is needed to deal with them. . . . I have but few friends in these parts, and am too weak and ailing to stand up, alone, against so many rebels."⁴ Accordingly, he exchanges with a friend in the home counties, where he feels himself to be in his own land, "et lingua mea est magis nota."⁵ 'The same barrier of language was still seen in all its obstructiveness in the Cornish rising of 1549 against the Book of Common Prayer, part of the grievance of the Cornish being that English was not their language.'⁶

¹ Freeman's *Old English History* (1878), p. 152.

² *Supra*, pp. 261, 262.

³ Grandisson's *Ep. R.*, Pt. III. p. xliv., and Pt. II. p. 820.

⁴ *Ibid.* Pt. III. p. liv.

⁵ *Ibid.* Pt. II. p. 958.

⁶ Memorandum contributed for this Memoir by Chancellor Edmonds, 1904.

The barrier of the different language was ultimately removed, but the geographical difficulty still remained. It has been seen how the wonderful energy and activity of such men as Bronescombe, Stapeldon, and Grandisson overcame it.¹ But not all bishops had their powers or will. The visits of more easy-going prelates of later centuries were few and far between. The clergy, left to themselves, kept less vigilant watch over their flocks, who sank, in consequence, into spiritual slumber, or wandered from the fold. Some of the pastors succumbed altogether, and became absolutely vicious; and though these formed the minority, yet in very few was the flame so bright as to kindle the hearts of others. And yet spiritual life did not wholly die in Celtic breasts; many felt an unsatisfied longing and craved for better food. No wonder if a quick response was given to John Wesley or his brother, "going in and out through the length and breadth of any district he might select as his field of labour, visiting and sleeping in humble cottages in rural parishes, and bringing the Church to the people who would not come to the Church, where too frequently apathy prevailed."² Wesley left his well-conceived system of local preachers behind him, and it wooed the hearts of Cornishmen far more effectually than did the regular ministry left without Episcopal supervision; for that defect still continued. Bishop Phillpotts, though quick to detect breaches of discipline, found the geographical difficulty too great an obstacle, and was seldom seen in Cornwall—except for his official visitations—especially towards the close of his long Episcopate. The introduction of railways had, in some degree, lessened the difficulty of communication, but it had

¹ *Supra*, pp. 257-262.

² Memorandum II., contributed for this Memoir by Mr. Edmund Carlyon, of S. Austell, 1904.

not removed it. Not even the penny post could be taken in lieu of the personal presence of a bishop, although offered as a substitute by a Home Secretary on behalf of the Crown.¹ "As for some of the remoter parishes, far off from the line of rail, with bad roads, and in a hilly country, it would take nearly as long to reach them from Exeter as to get from London to Paris by the fast night mail."²

To the geographical barrier that of occupation was added. The inhabitants of Devon are chiefly agricultural, while Cornishmen find their livelihood chiefly in mining and fishing. It is not easy to exaggerate the difference in tone and character which results from a difference of occupation and corresponding interest of life. The situation is well summed up in the words of Chancellor Edmonds: "Thus quite unconsciously the Cornish part of the diocese . . . carried in its bosom the elements of its ancient unity in itself. . . . The barrier of race had long been obliterated, the language of the dominant race had long ceased to be an alien speech, but geography and race and history," and perhaps it may be added difference in the occupation of the people, "combined to make a separate diocese of Cornwall a plain necessity."³

The feeling in favour of the reassertion of this unity through a revival of the separate Episcopate had long slept; but with the revival of Church life in the middle of the nineteenth century it began to revive. In 1847 the then Prime Minister, Lord John Russell, influenced possibly by the growth of

¹ In 1863 a petition from both Houses of Convocation, praying for the revival of the Cornish Bishopric, was refused on the ground of "the great facilities for Episcopal administration obtained by the progress of railroads and the penny post" (*Record Newspaper*, 1863).

² Letter to the Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., from the Rev. W. S. Lach-Szyrma, M.A., 1869.

³ Memorandum contributed for this Memoir by Chancellor Edmonds, 1904.

some local feeling, included Cornwall in the Bill for the erection of four new bishoprics. Public opinion was not sufficiently matured to ensure the passing of the Bill; but from that time forward the movement never wholly ceased. Some eight years later a Royal Commission, appointed to inquire into the condition of cathedrals in England, amplified their reference by recommending the restoration of the bishopric to Cornwall. Bishop Phillpotts had both that sympathy with the growing Church feeling of the day which favoured an increase of the Episcopacy, and also the practical insight to see the necessity for applying the principle to his own diocese. With characteristic generosity he offered to resign his patronage of all the Episcopal livings in the county of Cornwall, and to subscribe £500 per annum from his own income, intimating also that he was prepared to promote proposals of a more permanent character.¹ Dr. Walker, Vicar of S. Columb Major, offered the advowson of that valuable living, of which he was the patron, towards the endowment of the see. Prebendary Tatham, Rector of Boconnoc and Broad Oak in the county of Cornwall, was a zealous promoter of a scheme for this purpose, and secretary of the committee which was formed to carry it out; and in 1869 the Rev. W. S. Lach-Szyrma wrote a letter to Mr. Gladstone, the Prime Minister, which he published, urging the revival of the bishopric. All these proposals were based on the supposition that a large portion of the income of the see would be provided by existing Church endowments, especially the Church property in Cornwall, which was in the hands of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners. It must be noted that the movement was especially ecclesiastical in

¹ A pamphlet of Prebendary Tatham, entitled "A Cornish Bishopric; the Necessity and Means for its Restoration, 1859."

its features, and reflected the current Church temper of the time. The Oxford school had not at that period embraced the wider life of the country within its sphere of thought and care. It was concerned with Episcopacy as an essential element in the life of the Divine Society, and desired its increase on that ground, without much reference to the need of it as an agency to enfold and bless the growing commercial enterprise and city life of the times. These characteristics were reflected in the local movement in the West. It was not so much on the mining population of Cornwall and social problems that thought was concentrated as on the deficiency of full Church organisation, and on the loss of spiritual influence which followed from a lack of full Episcopal ministry. The feeling was intense in those who took part in the movement; but the interest was confined to a few, and the conception was not ample.

Such was the position of affairs when Dr. Temple was nominated to the See of Exeter. A large proportion of the supporters of the scheme for the division of the diocese belonged to the "straightest sect" of Churchmen—notably Prebendary Tatham, the Secretary of the Committee. Upon these, the news of Dr. Temple's nomination fell like a thunderbolt. They saw in it the death-blow of all their hopes. Those who viewed the matter most seriously wrote letters, signed memorials, and convened meetings; a less serious view of the case was expressed in the witticism—"We have memorialised Gladstone to *divide* the diocese, and he has sent us—Temple."¹ Few expected a favourable issue. But Dr. Temple himself was not dismayed. It appears that at the time of his nomination the Prime Minister was considering representations which had been made

¹ Letter to Prebendary Tatham, December 14, 1869.

to him from Cornwall in favour of a revival of the See, and that the Bishop-Nominate of Exeter had given assurance that the whole matter should receive full consideration after he had entered his new diocese, and that he would then test both the extent of his own powers to do the work of the undivided diocese, and the force of the local feeling in favour of the division.

This he set himself to do in the first three years of his Episcopate. Several weeks of his first summer were spent in the neighbourhood of S. Austell, where he occupied Nansladron, a house in the parish of S. Ewe. The following year, Glen Dorgal on the north coast, in the parish of S. Columb Minor was lent him by the proprietor, Mr. Francis Rodd of Trebartha Hall. He spent some weeks of a succeeding summer in the vicarage house of S. Breward, near Bodmin, of which Dr. Martin—a much-respected friend, who had once been mathematical master at Blundell's School, and afterwards Principal of the Exeter Training College—was incumbent. At S. Breward he not only made himself responsible for the duties in church, but, renewing the experiences of younger days at Culmstock, he taught in the village Sunday School. Using these places as in some sort mission stations, he visited the adjoining districts, and was seen everywhere by both high and low. Other visits into the county for Confirmations, church openings, and sermons were frequent. He came to know and get himself known, and he succeeded. Being of Cornish blood he “took kindly” to the Cornish people, says Mr. Carlyon, and they to him.¹ “No one got hold of the Cornish in the way he did,” is the remark of one who has the same reason as Bishop Temple had

¹ Memorandum II., contributed to this Memoir by Mr. Edmund Carlyon, 1904.

for knowing Cornishmen. Even one who was not Cornish himself could see how much the homely heartiness told, and how greatly the fact that the Bishop was one of themselves appealed to Cornish instincts. When he stood in company with his friend Saltren Rogers in Gwennap Pit, and looked round the great natural amphitheatre in which a multitude of Cornish men had once responded to the stirring appeals of John Wesley, he was filled with a different mind towards Wesleyans from that which animated his own predecessor, Bishop Lavington;¹ and he stood there, not as a Bishop only, but as a Cornishman, with his heart full of the memories of all the influence brought to bear on his fellow-countrymen by the mighty evangelist of the eighteenth century. When he preached in the Cornish pulpits some reflection of the spirit of John Wesley seemed cast upon him, and the rugged eloquence had even more than its usual power. Simple incidents come back recalling the impression produced. On one occasion an old peasant woman trudged many miles across the moor, bringing a present of honeycomb because the Bishop was Cornish like herself. Often ejaculations of "Alleluiah," "Praise the Lord," and loud "Amens," after the Cornish manner, used to sound in the crowded seats. The Bishop was careful to note, after such ebullitions, that S. Paul desired that the "spirits of the prophets should be subject to the prophets,"² but he was helped by the evident token of sympathy with his message which these irregularities implied. He drew the clergy, no less

¹ *Supra*, p. 268.

² When Bishop Temple went to confirm in the parish of Pendean, old Mr. Aitken, father of modern missionaries, narrated how when a deputy-bishop came on a like errand several years before, he had been disturbed by these irregular responds on the part of the Confirmation candidates, and remonstrated. "You may stop them, my Lord, if you can, but now they have once begun it is beyond me," was Mr. Aitken's perhaps not unwilling answer.

than the people, and the lighter as well as the more serious moods had their effect. Sometimes he was playing with golden-haired children on the Rectory lawn; sometimes, with head bared, he was breasting Cornish hills, and provoking from the panting clergyman on the return from the hot walk the question—"I say, Sandford, does your Bishop always walk like that?" Sometimes he was peering, all unconcerned, over a precipitous cliff while the incumbent, alarmed for his Bishop's safety, hung on to his coat-tails. But whether thus off duty, or giving clear, shrewd advice on parochial difficulties, or again, discarding all brusqueness, and with deepest sympathy responding to individual spiritual needs, he began to prevail; the simplicity of the man's nature spoke "with power." A fellowship of men who caught the inspiration formed around him. Not a few of those who were gathered into it had passed away before the long life of Bishop Temple closed—Chappell of Camborne, and Mills of S. Erth, and Phillpotts of Porth Gwidden—later still, Paul Bush, Scott's successor at Duloe, and now his dear friend, Saltren Rogers; and last of all, Tyacke of Helston, have been taken; but a remnant still remain to recall how the man, whose coming was to shatter hopes and frustrate work, falsified these predictions, and brought home to many who were sceptical on the point the real usefulness of the bishop's office, and the good that would accrue to Cornwall from having a bishop of her own.

The Bishop was not insensible to this growing feeling, and moreover, from all that he saw, he began to think that he understood the line of action which the problems of Church life in Cornwall required. He recognised both the defects and the merits of the prevailing Wesleyanism. He saw the causes for it in the past history of the

Church, and in the special character of the people. He saw also that much of it was not as yet Non-conformity in any formal sense. One who is four-score years of age, himself the son of a Cornish rector, bears witness "to the fact that at the time of Bishop Phillpotts' coming to the diocese, and for a long time afterwards, Wesleyan Methodists did not desert the Parish Church services and her Ordinances, and their own modest Chapels in outlying parts were not open during the hours of Divine Service in the Parish Church."¹ It may be that the stricter ecclesiastical *régime* of his predecessor, and the continued want of a Bishop of Cornwall, had tended to widen the breach; but still it seemed to Bishop Temple at his coming that differences were not irreconcilable, and that he saw an ultimate church unity which was compatible with the preservation of much that Wesleyans and even more pronounced Nonconformists prized. The several denominations would be communities within the Church, and each would represent a special form and view of Christian truth, while the Church would be the home in which the fulness of the Faith would abide, and the organ through which central truths would find expression. In order to attract the Cornish mind by exhibiting the spiritual side of the Church's work, he held more than one Ordination in Cornwall during his short Episcopate. The first of these took place in S. Mary's Church, Truro, on Trinity Sunday, 1871, and this view of an ultimate unity was the thought running through the sermon which he preached. Taking for his text S. Paul's words to the Corinthians (1 Cor. ii. 2), "For I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and Him crucified," the Bishop began by showing that while the Greeks,

¹ Memorandum II., contributed for this Memoir by Mr. E. Carlyon, 1904.

after their manner, "were thinking of the strife of words, S. Paul was thinking of spiritual life ; while they were thinking of precise and subtle distinctions, S. Paul was thinking" of central truths and of a life surrendered to Christ ; and then he proceeded :—

This contrast between what the Corinthians expected and what S. Paul intended to give them marked also, at all times, the special contrast which distinguished the Christian Church from all the religious bodies comprehended within it. It was of the very essence of all such bodies within the Church that they should mark out some special form of truth by which they would hold, and which was the very condition of their existence. He did not mean to say that this form of truth was of necessity an untrue or imperfect form ; . . . but they took it as the very condition of their existence, and by so doing they marked themselves out as not being the whole Church of Christ, but only a special section of it. They existed for the sake, not of bringing men to Christ only, but for the sake of bringing men to Christ through this or that particular channel ; they desired that all should accept the truth of God in the form in which they put it. . . . But it was a special mark of the Catholic Church of Christ to know nothing save Jesus Christ and Him crucified. It was not, of course, that forms of truth were indifferent to it, any more than to S. Paul, but it contended that all these things were mere means towards a great end, and the great end was Christ—and Christ only. . . .

He was speaking to those who were to be ordained ministers in the Catholic Church—to those who were about to be sent forth to minister in the name of the Church as a whole. But not only so ; he was speaking in respect to those who were to be sent forth to minister in a country that had accepted their branch of the Catholic Church, and had taken it to be the instrument in keeping up the religious life of the whole land, and in bringing every man in the land to Christ ; and inasmuch as their branch of the whole Church had accepted this mission, he wished them to observe that there was upon them, as ministers of such a Church, a special duty to bear in mind this great truth. No other Christian denominations in the country had a

mission to those who were not willing to accept their ministry. Not so the responsibility of the Church. Its responsibility was to all alike. If any man had not yet come to Christ, the minister of the Church was bound to feel that his mission was to that man, and they could not say, "Others perhaps may succeed where I failed." . . . They might have done their best, but the measure of their mission was the whole country, and as long as there was any man who had not yet learnt the truth as it was in Christ, their labours were not done. They must still go on.

There were others, as he said, who were labouring in a different way. He for his part had no hesitation at all in saying that he looked upon the ministers of every denomination in this country as true ministers of Christ. He knew no test by which their work could be tried which would not come to that result, because he saw that men under their ministry had accepted God's truth; and when he saw that the Lord, Master of them all, had so blessed their work, he could not doubt for one moment that their work had His approval, and that He had sent them. But still their mission was partial. Their mission was limited by the particular form of truth which they had to teach. But the Church had a larger and fuller mission. . . .

And as it seemed to him, there was about the mission of the Church a nobility which corresponded with that largeness and fulness. And so it was for this reason that in the Church of Christ, and in the branch of it to which they belonged, there must of necessity be a diversity of opinion which they could not have in any special denomination. The Church had a mission so wide that diversity of opinion became a necessity, but it was held together by the largeness of its mission, and men who differed from each other very widely indeed, still belonged together to the same Church, because they felt that their consciences were satisfied with the fulness and breadth of their task. . . . And so this diversity of opinion among the ministers of the Church which sometimes, in their eagerness and desire to come as close as they could to the very truth of God, may produce unseemly controversies and give reason to men outside to say how they quarrelled amongst one another, was, nevertheless, the very condition of the mission on which they were sent. Such controversies there always must be within a Church which had such work to do. . . .

Well may the question be put, Was it true that the ministers in the Church really acknowledged this diversity, and were content to accept it as a condition of the largeness of the work they had to do? The answer to the questions was that they were but men, and that even when conscious of the greatness of the task given them, and even when they saw how heavy was the responsibility, yet still they did not—and the weakness of human nature was such that they could not—lift themselves up to that high and noble mission. And also as men . . . they could not help being blind very often, short-sighted always. They could not help sometimes being shut up within their own narrow intellects, and unable to see that which did not come within their range. And their labour, too, though indeed it was heavy upon those who felt it, heavy with a weight that pressed day and night on some, yet still they could not always feel how much they were charged to do. . . . And so he did not say that the Church of England had ever fulfilled its great mission as it ought. . . . But this should be always the predominating thing in the Christian minister's soul—he had to teach what he believed to be true; to use and interpret the present forms put into his hands, according as his conscience dictated,—but he had to remember that above all forms, above all interpretations, still would stand the one great purpose of his mission, to bring men to Christ, and Him crucified; the test of the fulfilment of his mission as a minister of the Catholic Church was his fidelity to the central aim, the Supreme Lord.¹

The Bishop concluded his sermon with some such words as these:—

A striking picture of the Church has been handed down to us through Papias of Hierapolis, a hearer of S. John the Evangelist. Papias tells us that the beloved disciple related how the Lord used to teach and say, 'The days will come, in which vines shall grow, each having ten thousand shoots, and on each shoot ten thousand branches, and on each branch again ten thousand twigs, and on each twig ten thousand clusters, and on each cluster ten thousand grapes, and each grape when pressed shall yield five-and-twenty measures of wine. And when any of the saints shall have taken hold of

¹ *West Briton and Cornwall Advertiser*, June 1871.

one of their clusters, another shall cry, I am a better cluster ; take me, bless the Lord through me.'¹ The words are fanciful, but truth lies behind them ; they speak of unity in diversity as the characteristic of the Church of the ultimate future, and of the only rivalry possible amongst its members—which can best help the redeemed to praise their Lord. May God give them grace to keep this vision before their eyes, and in this spirit to devote themselves to their great task.

The sermon provoked not a little criticism at the time on account of its breadth of view, and its supposed surrender of the Church position, and of the doctrine of the apostolic succession of the ministry. To the succession as an historic fact Bishop Temple always clung, and this belief he expressed, both in his private² and public utterances,—notably in the sermon preached at the Consecration of Truro Cathedral, which must be read as the complement of the sermon at the Truro Ordination in 1871. "The purpose of that succession," he says in this second sermon, "is to link the Church of the present, from generation to generation, back by steps that cannot be mistaken, to the first appointment of the Apostles by the Lord. The purpose of that succession is to make men feel the unity of the body as it comes down the stream of history, and, if possible, to touch their hearts with some sense of that power which the Lord bequeathed when He ascended up on high and gave gifts to men."³ Bishop Temple accepted the fact and believed in its power. The Church was to him a divine creation ; it "takes its origin," he says in the same sermon, "not in the will of man, but in the will of the Lord Jesus" : and, "It is for this that we insist upon the

¹ Irenæus, *Haer.* v. 33, 3, 4.

² Editor's Supplement, vol. ii. pp. 521 and 566 ; also "London" Memoir, p. 10.

³ Sermon preached at the Consecration of Truro Cathedral, November 3, 1887.

succession of the ministry, because we find the Church from the very beginning flowing out of the ministry." Again, in a letter written to Bishop Benson in June 1877, he writes :—

Wesley laid great stress on the right of "the Ministers" to govern the Church and to decide all questions of doctrine, and would not allow any Layman to have any voice in such matters. This logically requires that the Ministry shall have a Commission independent of the Laity. And this logically requires that there shall be a succession. And they wince if it be pointed out that they have no succession. And if your finger points in that direction they turn very cross immediately.

But in spite of this strong position he shrank from condemning an "irregular" order in face of the manifest blessings that had rested on Wesleyan work. He made much of the principle involved in the words, "By their fruits ye shall know them," and he applied it largely as a test of Divine acceptance of work done. To him, Wesleyanism, as he saw it in Cornwall, although not having full credentials, was an agency in the Divine economy. It was not because his conception of the Church was inadequate, but because it was so full that he held this view. He recognised the truth set forth in the allegory of Papias, and he believed that the road to its realisation lay in the concentration of the Church upon the larger and essential verities, while it allowed the freest scope to different schools and denominations for the enforcement of special tenets and rules of life. Moreover, he thought that the final goal would be more surely reached if the ancient church—her Episcopate and all her ministry, clothed with the power and authority which came down to them from primitive days—were to throw herself with full energy into the solution of the social problems of modern life. This had been the idea of the student on which he

loved to dwell when writing to his friends, and it was the aspiration of the Bishop.

But the fruition of the vision was not for his eyes, and though he thought that he understood something of the methods by which the vision could be realised, the experience of four years' hard work had taught him that the strain was too great for a single man who had the responsibility of other labours heavy upon him. He was the pioneer, but he was "not to go over Jordan," and he thus expresses himself in answer to a memorial addressed to him by Cornish clergy in November 1874: "I can assure the memorialists that I feel as much as they do, and perhaps even more, the need of that division of the Diocese of Exeter which they desire. That I should not put any obstacles in the way of such a division was understood when I first accepted the bishopric; and my experience of the work, without any suggestion from others, would have made me feel it a plain duty to advocate the creation of a Bishopric of Cornwall if ever an opportunity offered."¹ By an effort he put the thought of retaining the Cornish section of the diocese from him, and threw the whole power of his energy into the work of carrying through the division. The force of the man's personality and his methods were such that what had hitherto been the pious aspiration of ecclesiastical minds was converted into the robust determination of a whole diocese.

The chief auxiliary on which the Bishop relied in accomplishing this work was his Diocesan Conference. In the aid which it gave to the revival of the Cornish See, more even than in launching the new educational work, the action of the Bishop in calling it together was justified. "I could never

¹ Letter from Bishop Temple to the Rev. F. Hockley, in reply to a Memorial, November 1874.

have carried through the Cornish Bishopric," he used to say in later years, "if it had not been for the Diocesan Conference." It was the assurance that he had the diocese at his back. By it the diocese was stirred; it was the organ through which it acted, and in the Diocesan Conference, the movement in Bishop Temple's time had its origin. It is believed that as early as 1871 the matter was incidentally mentioned at a meeting in Truro over which the Bishop was presiding; but the actual beginning of the movement may be dated from the Diocesan Conference of 1874, when Mr. Edmund Carlyon, of S. Austell, took the occasion of a discussion raised by the Rev. E. N. Dumbleton, then Vicar of S. Paul's church in Truro, to introduce the subject.

In entering upon any scheme for the increase of Church agencies (Mr. Carlyon said), they ought to consider whether their superintendence under present conditions would not be more than one Bishop could manage. The diocese was very large and ought to be divided . . . and he would further venture to say as a Cornish representative that the only drawback in such a solution of the question would be the possible loss to Cornwall of their present Diocesan; and that if the Bishop would select Cornwall instead of Exeter as his future see, it would add much to the happiness as regards Cornwall of the result of the efforts to divide the diocese.¹

The Bishop said nothing, but smiled. The smile was historic. To it the Cornishmen present are wont to trace the renewal of their long-cherished design. From the face of the Bishop the smile spread over the face of the diocese. On March 1, 1875, Mr. Carlyon convened a meeting at the Royal Hotel, Plymouth, under the presidency of the Rev. C. C. Bartholomew, R.D. Dr. Temple was not present, but the announcement was made

¹ Memorandum I., contributed for this Memoir by Mr. E. Carlyon, 1903; and Report of Diocesan Conference, 1874, *Exeter and Plymouth Gazette*.

that he was willing to surrender £800 a year of the income of the see in furtherance of a scheme for the revival of the bishopric. A Committee was formed, and it was agreed that a deputation should wait upon the Prime Minister to bring the project before him.¹

On May 28, 1875, Mr. Disraeli received it. His manner and words were gracious; but an incident which in later years Dr. Temple used to recall with amusement, showed where, for the time, the difficulty lay. The Bishop had travelled up from the neighbourhood of the Land's End, and in order to give some point to his remarks, began as follows :—

It may give you some idea, sir, of the need for this change if I state that the extremity of my diocese is 140 miles distant from its centre, Exeter, and that, in order to have the opportunity of meeting you this morning, being at present engaged in work near Penzance, I found it necessary to travel all night.

More was to follow; but at once and with great politeness came the remark, “You must be very tired; *won't you sit down?*” It stopped the flow of the Bishop's eloquence, and, whether intentionally or not, took the wind out of the sails. “I never felt so exquisitely snubbed in my life,” the Bishop used to say in telling the story. He sat down, but the effect produced on his mind was precisely what was required. Previous efforts for the revival of the see had failed because they relied more or less upon a grant from Public Church Funds, and the Bishop was now confirmed in his view that the Government had no intention of making such a grant, and meant to throw the applicants back upon their own resources. This belief he had already expressed, two months before, in a letter to Mr. Carlyon :—

¹ Memorandum I., contributed for this Memoir by Mr. E. Carlyon.

EXETER, *March 8, 1875.*

MY DEAR SIR—Nothing will strengthen my hands except such an expression of desire for a Cornish Bishopric as would be shown by a large Cornish subscription. All the world over men measure earnestness by the sacrifices which it prompts, and in London I hear but one comment on the matter: "We shall judge by the subscriptions." That I am in earnest I have tried to show. Until Cornwall shows it in the same way, we shall make very little progress.

And I am decidedly against the creation of a new set of bishops at lower salaries; bishoprics so endowed will either be filled by men of less ability, or be made stepping-stones.

I have written quite frankly, because it is of some importance that we should understand each other in such a matter.—Yours very truly,
F. EXON.

With a view to stimulating voluntary effort, the Earl of Devon moved the following resolution in the ensuing session of the Diocesan Conference (1875): "That, whilst the necessities of the Church in England and Wales demand an increase of the Episcopate, nowhere are those necessities more conspicuous than in the Diocese of Exeter. In order, therefore, to promote a division of this diocese, and the creation of a bishopric in Cornwall, it is expedient that a Committee be formed, to be called 'The Diocesan Committee for promoting the restoration of a Bishopric in Cornwall.'" To this resolution a rider was added on the motion of the Rev. R. Hobhouse, a most respected Cornish clergyman, whose early opposition to Bishop Temple had given way before the evidence of hard work and sincerity: "That it shall be the duty of the Committee to co-operate with the Bishop in all reasonable measures likely to procure such restoration." The Bishop was made Chairman of the Committee; Archdeacon Earle and (subsequently) the Earl of Devon, Vice-Chairmen; Mr. Carlyon was appointed Secretary.

The first fruits of the appointment of the Com-

mittee were seen in the announcement of a princely donation on the part of Lady Rolle of £40,000 towards the Endowment Fund. Stimulated by this munificence, the Committee put out their first appeal to the diocese. It gave the previous history of the movement and the reasons for it, and concluded with the following words from the Bishop :—

In signing this statement and appeal as Chairman of the Committee appointed by the Diocesan Conference, I desire to add on my own behalf, as Bishop of the diocese, that my six years' experience of the work to be done has made me feel (and that more and more every succeeding year) how impossible it is for one man to do all that is required from a bishop throughout so extensive an area; not only has the work to be done with a steady speed which it is difficult to maintain for any length of time, but much has to be left undone which it would be of advantage to the efficiency of the Church's work that the Bishop should do. This is felt by many of the clergy, and it is no less felt by the Bishop; and I have no doubt that both Devon and Cornwall would greatly gain in this respect if each county were a diocese by itself.

It will be, in my judgment, very much to be regretted if the present opportunity be lost, and the munificent offer of £1200 a year be made in vain for lack of a sufficient sum being raised to meet it.

F. EXON.

January 1876.

Events moved quickly as soon as the Committee set to work. The issue of the appeal was followed by an arrangement for central meetings in promotion of the Bishopric Fund to be held in the chief towns of the diocese. Lord Devon was present at many of them, and by his earnest advocacy no less than by his high official position as Lord Lieutenant of Devon, and the respect in which his personal character was held, became the Bishop's right-hand man in the cause. Archdeacon Earle was fervent and ready, Mr. Cárlyon inde-

fatigable, and the Bishop carried conviction by his unadorned eloquence.

The general question of the increase of the Episcopate was in the air, and in the previous year, 1875, Lord Lyttelton had carried an enabling Bill for that purpose through the House of Lords. The Bishop of Exeter had taken part in the discussion, and had vividly described his own overwork under present conditions :—

He might say that during the first year after his appointment to the Diocese of Exeter he was at work every day from an early hour in the morning until a late hour at night ; so much so, that when the late Government asked him to allow his name to be put upon a Commission of some importance, he was obliged to refuse on the ground that until the end of the year he had only eleven days at his disposal, and afterwards even those days were filled up.¹

It had been found impossible to carry this Bill beyond the Upper House, but fortified by the success of the first efforts to raise the endowment by voluntary effort in the western counties, the Government introduced a Bill for the revival of the Cornish See in 1876. The Bill provided for the transfer of sufficient endowment from the Bishopric of Exeter to yield an annual income from that source of £800 ; but with this exception the funds were to be raised from private sources. The ultimate income of the bishop was fixed at £3000 annually. Truro was selected as the Cathedral city. The patronage held by the Bishop of Exeter in Cornwall was transferred to the Bishop of Truro. The Ecclesiastical Commissioners were empowered to prepare a scheme for creating new Archdeaconries ; and, pending the constitution of a Dean and Chapter in the new diocese, for founding Honorary Canonries. The Church of S. Mary, Truro, was to serve as the Cathedral Church.

¹ Second reading of the Increase of the Episcopate Bill, February 23, 1875.

The Bill was piloted through the Lower House by Mr. (afterwards Lord) Cross, the Home Secretary, who in his introductory speech¹ paid the following tributes, both to Lady Rolle and Dr. Temple :—

There had been an offer of £1200 a year from a single individual for the formation of this see, but there was a condition attached to that, viz. that the see shall be formed in the lifetime of the donor. That gift had been most generously met by the Bishop of the diocese. The see of Exeter was entitled to £5000 a year, and it was of the class of ordinary bishoprics. It was proposed to transfer it from the higher class to the lower class of bishoprics, and it would consequently receive £4200—the lowest sum that was received by ordinary bishoprics. But the Bishop of the diocese, with all the generosity and zeal which characterised him in every act of his life, insisted that the reduction in his income of £800 per annum should begin from the moment the new diocese was founded, and that they should not wait till his death, for he wanted to make the self-sacrifice for the good of the Church. That was a noble example, which entitled the Bishop to due consideration at their hands.

The art of Parliamentary obstruction had not then been perfected, and in spite of some opposition from Welsh and Irish members the Bill passed through the House of Commons without much difficulty. Under the guidance of the Duke of Richmond and Gordon, the Government leader, it was quickly carried through the Upper House, and received the Royal assent before the close of the session (1876).

In comparison with the dreary length of time spent in later efforts for the creation of new sees, the celerity with which the revival of the Cornish See became an accomplished fact is marvellous. In his opening address at the ensuing session of the Diocesan Conference, 1876,² the Bishop gratefully owned the obligation under which the diocese stood to Lady Rolle, Lord Devon, and

¹ June 9, 1876.

² October 24, 1876.

Mr. Carlyon, and the extent to which the action of the Conference itself had expedited the realisation of their hopes :—

He wished to congratulate the diocese on the fact of their having appointed the Cornish Bishopric Committee last year. He did not think any one but himself could be aware how very fortunate that appointment was, because the extraordinary munificence of Lady Rolle for the first time made it possible to accomplish this work within a very limited period. They would have found very much greater difficulty in following up Lady Rolle's munificence if that Committee had not been in existence. She wrote in the first instance to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who communicated at once with himself and Mr. Cross, the Home Secretary. He (the Bishop) was not informed at that time who the donor was, but he was requested to see Mr. Cross immediately on the subject, and the first question he asked him was, "How can you get the diocese as a whole to act in support of Lady Rolle's proposal?"

He told Mr. Cross that a committee had been already appointed for the very purpose by the Conference of the diocese, and that that committee had the authority of the whole diocese to support it. Mr. Cross then said that would no doubt hasten matters very much. . . . He hoped he might say how much they owed in this work to the unremitting labours of two laymen—Lord Devon and Mr. Carlyon. Mr. Carlyon had worked at it with a devotion which, he might say, very largely overbalanced a very large subscription. Lord Devon had been the leading spirit in everything that had been done. He (the Bishop) felt it had been a very admirable move,—he felt grateful to God for having brought it about. He could not have believed last year that there was any chance of such a thing being done in ten years at least. The Bishop ended by saying how greatly the Conference would miss their Cornish brethren when they left them.¹

His reply "to the vote of thanks for his own labours in the cause was full of the warmth of feeling which he always showed when really stirred :—

¹ *Exeter and Plymouth Gazette*, October 1876.

He felt their kindness the more because the longer he had worked in the diocese the more he found their hearts had been towards him. He had found the clergy willing in every possible way to make the Bishop's work not only easy, but delightful. The sacrifice of income and patronage was in reality a very small part of what he would sacrifice in this case. He felt far more the sacrifice of the warm, the cordial, the affectionate kindness with which so large a part of his work had always been met in Cornwall.¹

Before the see could actually be founded, the issue of a second appeal was necessary. The diocese quickly responded, and before the year closed the Bishop was able to announce to the Church Congress (1876), which opportunely met at Plymouth and was a witness of the success of the western counties in their great effort, that the full sum needed to secure Lady Rolle's benefaction had been raised.

This announcement was shortly afterwards followed by Dr. Benson's appointment as first Bishop of the revived diocese. The choice of his friend to take charge of Cornwall was a great delight to Bishop Temple. "You *must* like your bishop very much. He is without any equal."² The two men were different; but what was lacking in one, the other supplied: each rejoiced in all that his friend possessed, and they never forgot their debt to each other. The new bishop was a constant and almost daily applicant for the advice of his elder Episcopal brother, both as to principles and details of action; the practice continuing through life. "I don't feel able to stir without you," writes Dr. Benson at a later period—and Dr. Temple never tired of responding. Here is a list of subjects upon which, in the "present distress," letters kept pouring in from Dr. Benson: Confirmations, and the duty of parish clergy in regard to

¹ *Exeter and Plymouth Gazette*, October 1876.

² Letter to the Rev. Saltren Rogers, R. D., June 5, 1877.

them; the baptism of adults; the expediency or otherwise of the continued residence in the parish of clergy incapacitated by age from work; relations with Wesleyans; the Truro Chapter Bill; the administration of Bishop Phillpotts' Trust for the training of ordination candidates. There is a correspondence amounting to fifty-nine letters on a single subject—the provision of an Episcopal residence at Truro. Most of these last letters involved legal questions or architectural detail, and must have cost him time and thought. True to his own invariable practice, Bishop Temple made a great point of securing that the bishop should reside in the mother city of the diocese, and brought all his business powers to bear on the subject. The vicarage house at Kenwyn, enlarged and adapted to its higher purpose, was the fruit of the joint labours of the two friends. In it the first bishop found a home during his tenure of the see, and although not occupied by his present successor, the Trusts still hold. It is ready for the Bishop of Truro whenever the present or any future prelate thinks well to resume actual possession.

The crowning acts of Consecration and Enthronement took place on the Festivals of S. Mark and SS. Philip and James, April 25 and May 1, of the following year, 1877, the former in S. Paul's Cathedral, and the latter in the church of S. Mary, Truro. The Bishop of Exeter was present on both occasions. Bishop Benson was, naturally, the centre of prayers and thoughts, but in this memoir it is natural to dwell on the senior Bishop who had prepared the way for his friend. The High Sheriff of Cornwall, Mr. Rashleigh, brought him the tribute of an old college acquaintance.

Of this I am certain, that even with the Bishop of Exeter and Lady Rolle's liberality, it would have been very difficult to have completed the work we had in hand, if it had

not been for the missionary tour which Bishop Temple took through Devon and Cornwall. The way in which he spoke at Penzance, S. Austell, and Bodmin stirred the hearts of those who were hesitating as to whether it was necessary to have a separate Bishop for Cornwall.¹

The new bishop combined his tribute of affection with the scholarly playfulness which was one of the habitual charms of his eloquence :—

I feel sure you will let me dwell for a moment on the name of one who has at once made it both easy and difficult for me to come here—easy because he has made the office of bishop dear to you—easy because I find the work mapped out with those same beautiful clear lines for me with which his work used to be mapped out for us at Rugby; and again most difficult, because any one who looks even at the records of toil among figures and statistics, which his schemes and plans show, and listens to the many burning thoughts of work and duty which he more than any one pours forth in the shortest time, in the most simple and unpretending way, must feel it is a task of no ordinary difficulty to step along the path which he has pointed out. . . .

To the Church in Cornwall what shall I say? . . . On the day of the battle of Cannæ, when the Carthaginian army was in so difficult a position on the banks of the Aufidus, when the hosts of the Roman army were displayed against it, it is said that the staff of Hannibal clustered around him, and in a moment all their anxiety was dispelled, for Hannibal laughed. And this morning, as we entered the Council Chamber, the first thing that was said to me was: "Look at the Bishop of Exeter; how cheerful he always is; how he is laughing." (Turning to Dr. Temple)—Our Hannibal! (Much laughter and applause.) We will think of no difficulties whatever when Hannibal laughs.²

Dr. Temple spoke with simple eloquence and generous affection :—

You know that what we are doing to-day is the crown of what has been sought for many years in this county. It is, I think, more than twenty years since the people of Cornwall

¹ *The Church in Cornwall*, vol. ii. No. 27, p. 13.

² *Ibid.* pp. 14, 17.

first began to demand that their ancient bishopric should be restored, and that they should have one of the chief officers of the Church placed among them, to encourage the clergy in their work, and to promote all that the Church has to do here amongst you. And for a long time, although we have earnestly desired it, very little could be done; but, at last, more, one may say, by the providence of God than by any exertion of ours, that wish has been crowned with success, our ancient bishopric has been restored, and Cornwall once more has become one of the dioceses of the English Church. And we trust that it is the beginning of what all will rejoice to see—a more energetic and a more earnest labour on the part of the Church of England to do its work here in this place, and more hearty appreciation of that work by all who see it. . . . But I confess that I neither expected that we should accomplish the effort in so short a time, nor still less could I have hoped that there should be such a crown to our work as that my dear and valued friend should have been the first occupant of this see. . . . I may be pardoned, even in his presence, if I express to you how deeply I feel the value to this part of the English Church of the services of such a man as I know my friend to be. I have known him for nearly twenty years with ever-increasing intimacy. I have known him and worked with him as a brother. A scholar of the very first rank, a man of the very widest reading, a man of the most genial sympathies, and, above all, one who gives his heart to our Lord and Master as few men are able to do it. Such a man I present to you to-day, to be welcomed as the first occupant of this see.¹

Bishop Temple was not thinking of himself, but those who then were gathered were thinking of him. It was a great achievement which had been accomplished when, to use Bishop Benson's phrase, 'a Cornishman gave back Cornwall to herself.' 'Seven years before he had come amongst them as an object of suspicion; his Episcopate was held to be foredoomed to failure, and his advent was regarded as the death-blow of cherished hopes. Now these hopes had been crowned with an extraordinary richness. Other

¹ *The Church in Cornwall*, vol. ii. No. 27, pp. 6-8.

men had done their part, but those who had done most knew best the real leader. The methods had been characteristic. There was no hurry, but when the time was ripe, the action was strong and continuous. There had been no grasping nor self-assertion; he used others and he recognised their work; but his were the large principles, and from him came the inspiration; his was not a lead of demonstration, but it was always ready when it was wanted, and it was a lead with power. Much progress has since been made; but Cornishmen will remember the Pioneer, the hand which sowed the seed for the harvest which others would reap, the man who laid the foundation-stone of a revived diocese, and by the spirit no less than by the extent of his work pointed the way to a yet greater revival, and helped to make it possible.

CHAPTER VII

THE BISHOP AND THE CLERGY

(*Ordinandi*)

Bishop Temple's relation to clerical life—First ordination sermon—Bishop Temple's views on theological colleges—Bishop Phillpotts' studentships—Ordination examinations—Notes and incidents—Ordinations at different centres.

AN attitude of aloofness from clerical life sometimes characterised Bishop Temple. He would speak of the clergy as an external body which had to be reckoned with; he would note their peculiarities and their interests with a special independence of judgment, as though he had no close connexion with them himself. This characteristic was partly the result of his official career at the Education Office, which had compelled him to stand off more or less from the clerical point of view, and during the Kneller Hall¹ period had made him the representative of a system to which special sections of the clergy were strongly opposed. His position as Headmaster had brought main interests of clerical life prominently before him, but not the parochial. And with the exception of short intervals during which he had been in charge of his friend, Dr. Scott's, living of Duloe, he had no experience of the work of a parish clergyman. But the main

¹ Editor's Supplement, vol. ii. p. 569.

cause of the detachment was to be found in his lay parentage and in the circumstances of his early life. The clerical calling stood apart in his estimate, and he invested it with the special sanctity with which his memory surrounded the parish priests of his early home. Unconsciously to himself he was always comparing the actual clergyman with the ideal. The attitude of aloofness exposed him to the charge from the clergy of censoriousness and want of sympathy, but it created an impression of freedom from clerical exclusiveness in the minds of the laity, and it led him always to set a high aim before his brethren. The real fact was that, while he was a layman's bishop in freedom from professional narrowness and in sympathy with large human interests, his past memories and the upward turn of his whole nature combined to inspire him with a strong and steady devotion to the clerical calling. In it he lived; its labours absorbed his energies; the spiritual life with which it was concerned was his food, and he was never so much at home as when he was urging his brother clergy to walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they were called. No mere ecclesiastic, he was yet specially a Bishop of the Church of God, and the supreme delight no less than the highest duty of his office was to live for his clergy. The more closely the details of his Episcopate are studied, the more closely the master motive is revealed: his aim was to bring the clergy nearer to the ideal.

And in a sense his concentration on this aim imparted a kind of narrowness and monotony to the line of his Episcopate. Genuine as was his interest, and indefatigable his toil, in social subjects, they were not the dominant theme of his addresses to the clergy. He was not a prolific writer on such topics like other leading ecclesiastics. In one of Lord Acton's letters he speaks of Temple's

“arid mind.”¹ The criticism shows that though the writer had read much, he had not read Dr. Temple’s personality ; what is true, and was possibly meant, is that Dr. Temple had not a fertile fancy or imagination ; there was no facile flow of new ideas in mature life, nor was it natural to him to set off the subjects on which he thought and wrote with much play of light and shade. Owing to this fact, but still more as the result of his conception of what was supreme in importance, he kept mainly in his addresses to the most direct teaching of Scripture, and spoke about it in direct and simple language. He was no friend of ambitious schemes, and sometimes a sense of disappointment was expressed by ardent friends that he had not fulfilled their anticipations by formulating any startling policy and diverging further from the lines of the conventional and ordinary. He did not follow his contribution to *Essays and Reviews* by appearing as a prophet of progressive theology ; he did not lead an advanced wing of political Churchmen. The reason sometimes given was that having reached higher altitudes he had become more wary in his ways, and had learnt that a safe policy is wisest for a leader. But there could be no more mistaken estimate of the man ; he gave himself to the plainest things, not because they were the safest, but because they were the main things ; he led his clergy in the path of common duty because he believed it to be the highest path.

Within these lines the Episcopate was in a marked sense educative. The Exeter Diocese under Bishop Temple rivals in this respect the Oxford Diocese under Bishop Wilberforce. The mode and kind of education were different, but in each case the clergy were being moulded by the

¹ *Letters of Lord Acton*, p. 204.

hand of their bishop, and were gradually and insensibly drawn to a fuller conception of their office. Under him ordinary duties assumed a new dignity, and clerical life, enlarged interest. Of ecclesiasticism there was little in the Bishop, and of sacerdotalism in the ordinary sense, none; but, as has been seen,¹ he had a high view of the origin of the Christian ministry, and, if possible, a yet higher view of its purpose. This comes out strikingly in his first Ordination sermon preached in Exeter Cathedral on the Feast of the Epiphany, 1870:—

“Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: we pray you in Christ’s stead, be ye reconciled to God.”—2 Cor. v. 20.

This is the character of the ministers of the Gospel; they are ambassadors for Christ, and their mission is to pray all people in Christ’s stead, that is, as He Himself would have prayed them, to be reconciled to God. A good ambassador, evidently enough, is he who loses himself entirely in the service of the sovereign who sends him. If on any occasion it should happen that his own wishes, or his interests, or purpose come athwart the duties he owes to the sovereign, it is plain enough he is unfaithful to his trust. . . .

This, brethren, is what is incumbent on us simply because we are ambassadors, but much more when we consider whose ambassadors we are. We are the ambassadors of Christ; therefore we shall see in Him the model which we are required to copy. How can we represent Him unless through our lives we make it our great endeavour absolutely to sacrifice ourselves as He surrendered Himself?—absolutely to give up all will of our own in the desire, the one desire, to have no other will but God’s. We might have supposed that for Him who was very God, no surrender of the will would be necessary. But He declares that He came not to do His own will, but the will of the Father who sent Him. This, brethren, runs through all His life. . . . His human character is not distinguished by any traits that seem to mark it off as distinct in kind, and yet all this which is so commonplace in itself is lifted up to the very throne of heaven by the Heavenly Love which pervades it all. It is surely when

¹ “Exeter” Memoir, p. 389.

He is most human that we are thrilled with a sense that He is Divine ; it is when He is most like ourselves that we feel most deeply how utterly unlike He is to all that man can be. It is because the power of the spirit transforms everything in Him, until it seems to be full of the heavenly brightness, that His life is all unlike ours. How shall we represent this? . . . We have, as I said, to deliver His message and maintain His dignity, and we can only do it by endeavouring to set before our people, not only in all that we say, but in the whole of our lives, that we are, to the very utmost of our power, copying the model that He has set before us. But if we do not even attempt this, if it does not enter into our thoughts, and we take up our profession of ministers of the Gospel just as if it were one profession among many others, just as if a minister of the Gospel were a man who had chosen that walk of life rather than some other ordinary profession—if we are seeking all the time our own pleasure, our own ease, our own will, the gratification of our own vanity, how can it be said for one moment that in any real sense at all we are ambassadors of Christ?

We are to be ambassadors of Christ, and in that capacity we have a *message* to deliver ; we are to pray the people to whom we have been sent to be reconciled to God. . . . There is one condition before any man can deliver such a message as this ; it is, first, that he should have had it delivered to his own soul. Unless the message has within it that reality which only comes from its being a real part of your own life, a great deal of what you are saying must inevitably be words, and nothing else. . . . If there be any truth that you are setting forth, of which it is possible for you to say, "Had it been untrue I should have been just the same as I am," then depend upon it such a belief as that is not a belief that would enable you to impress the truth upon your people—it is not a belief that will enable you to be a real ambassador of Christ to deliver that message. Spiritual teaching must be backed up by truth of life, or else it loses its power. . . .

Specially does this hold in regard to the truth, which is the sum and substance of the message—reconciliation to God. A minister of Christ must contend earnestly within himself against sin, and then he will be able to tell sinners what the battle against sin is like. He must stand out against temptation, and then he will be able to tell his

hearers what it is to resist temptation. He will be blest with victory in the struggle, and then he will be able to tell them what no one else can possibly tell, what is the blessing that attends such victory. He will look to the one source of strength and cleansing, the Cross of Christ, and then he will be able to say in words that will reach his hearers' hearts, what is the power of that Cross to save. But if he derives all this from books and from study, and takes it up simply from what he has heard or read, he may preach it if he will, and God in His mercy may give the word power which it would not have from him, but he cannot be an efficient minister of Christ to deliver such a message as this, "Be ye reconciled to God."

. . . Be ye reconciled to God is the prayer of Christ's ambassador; he measures all his work by this—am I now doing what will help my brethren to be reconciled to God? The Heavenly Father longs to take His children home, and only waits for them to come. Is our teaching, preaching, all the words we use in conversation and by the bedside, directed to this end? We have other things, perhaps, to think of, but they are all necessarily secondary. They all have to be judged by their effect in producing this one result. To convert a sinner, to bring back people really to God, to unite them to their Father, to help them day by day to live even if it be but a little better than before, to be a little more true, a little more just, a little more pure, and, most of all, to cling to Christ as the one Saviour who alone can save—if we can do this, then at the last day may we hope, as S. Paul hoped, that our flocks may be to us a joy and a crown of rejoicing.¹

These words give the keynote to his whole thought and aim in regard to the clergy. It was to be expected that with this high sense of the sacredness of the calling he would lay great stress on all the preparations for it. Reviewing the whole position from the standpoint of his long Episcopate of more than thirty years, he speaks favourably, as President of Convocation in 1900, of the progress on the intellectual and, still more, the moral and spiritual side which had taken place in

¹ *Exeter and Plymouth Gazette*, January 7, 1870.

the candidates for ordination during that period ; but that he had no very high opinion of the standard when he came to Exeter is plain from words written to his friend, Dr. Benson, in 1871 :—

I am glad, but not a little surprised, at your finding the examination for Orders “very cheering.” You must get the pick. Here it is a perpetually renewed anxiety to me, and I ask myself over and over again, How is it to be hoped that these men shall teach when they seem to possess so little depth of knowledge, so little thought, so little passion of self-sacrifice ? But I daresay I am a hard judge.¹

But the judgment would be borne out by others.

Happily, as in the case of the education question, he entered upon his diocese at a time when special opportunities presented themselves for supplying manifest needs. The keen eye of his predecessor discerned what would be one of the most urgent requirements of the near future, and, with characteristic generosity, he had devoted considerable sums during the last years of his life to the training of theological students. By the joint action of the Bishop and the Dean and Chapter, the nucleus of a Theological College had been formed at Exeter in 1861. The late Dr. Ellicott, until recently Bishop of Gloucester, and at that time Dean of Exeter, became Principal, and under him the late Rev. R. C. Pascoé and the Rev. J. N. Hardy held office as Vice-Presidents. On the Dean's elevation to the Episcopate he was succeeded as Principal by Canon Harold Browne, subsequently Bishop of Winchester ; but notwithstanding the distinguished auspices under which the College was started, it met with but limited success. The students, who, pending the erection of permanent buildings, occupied lodgings in the city, were few in number, and in 1867 the College was closed. Bishop Phillpotts mainly supported the College during his

¹ Letter to Dr. Benson, December 27, 1871.

lifetime. Soon after his death, in 1869, his executors handed over the sum of £11,204 to the Dean and Chapter, as Trustees and Managers, for the further promotion of the scheme.¹ A plan for remodelling it, on the basis of an arrangement for locating students with experienced clergymen of the diocese, and carrying on the work under the general superintendence of a Principal in Exeter, with whom the students were to reside for a limited period in each year, was then attempted. It had the concurrence of Bishop Temple, and accorded with his general line of thought, which favoured as large an infusion as possible of the parochial element into the training of the clergy; but it may be doubted whether it received the hearty support of the Chapter generally, and it was laid aside. Finally the scheme was adopted which has been in operation with marked success since its approval by the Charity Commissioners as a tentative measure in 1878.² It appears to have been drafted by Canon Cook, with the advice of Bishop Temple, and it was due chiefly to the Bishop's efforts and influence that the Charity Commissioners were induced ultimately to sanction "so wide a departure from the Founder's design of establishing a Theological College." The scheme provides that the income of the endowment, amounting to some £300 per annum, shall be expended in exhibitions tenable by students at the older Universities who have completed their undergraduate course, and are selected after examination and evidence given of possession of satisfactory moral qualifications. The exhibitioners attend the lectures of the Divinity Professors, and are placed under the special superintendence of one of them; they are

¹ Statement supplied to the Charity Commissioners in 1877 by the Dean and Chapter of Exeter, and Memorandum contributed for the purposes of the Memoir (1904) by Mr. W. J. Battishill, Chapter Clerk.

² Letter from Charity Commissioners, July 16, 1878.

attached to certain of the parochial clergy of the University city in order to learn something of pastoral work, and they undertake to seek Holy Orders, and to serve for two years in the diocese of either Exeter or Truro. Some hundred students have been elected in the twenty-seven years during which the scheme has been in operation, and not a few of the most promising clergy of the two dioceses have been chosen from their number.

The breadth of view which characterises this scheme gives proof of its parentage. The Bishop's preference of it to a renewed attempt to establish a Theological College at Exeter was characteristic. His sense of the considerable services which Theological Colleges have rendered in raising both the mental and spiritual standard of the clergy grew increasingly with his experience as a bishop; but his latest utterances on the subject in Convocation make it plain that to the very end he was sensitive as to their tendency in some instances to favour a less manly type of character and to produce narrowness and extravagance of view and practice, especially when set up in small areas, and containing only a limited number of students.

There can be no question, in the first place, beginning with the lowest consideration, that a larger college is able to have a much stronger staff than a smaller college. You can get better teaching and a wider range of subjects by having a larger number of students. At present very often the number of students is so small that the colleges get into financial difficulties. These colleges cannot be altogether supported from without. Besides this, which is of course the lowest consideration, I think that the influence of a strong man is far more healthy when he has a larger number to deal with, because, although the strong man may be free from peculiarities and special views and the like, and may earnestly desire to be quite impartial among the different schools of thought, it is inevitable, do what he will, that there will be a tendency on the part of the students, if there is only a small number, rather to copy his peculiarities than

to obtain the benefit of his larger and deeper views. The influence which is exercised upon a larger body is of a different kind from that which is exercised upon a much smaller body. . . . I should say, without any hesitation, that a theological college of one hundred was a far more wholesome thing than a college of twenty. It will be better taught. It will be inspired altogether on higher and broader lines. For it must never be forgotten that if a man is a real teacher he necessarily, to a very great extent, forms himself upon those whom he is teaching as well as forms them. As a great teacher once said to his pupils, "You are my wings." The learners are the wings upon which the leading man rises to his highest and best instruction of those whom he has to instruct.¹

His sympathies were with the two later experiments at Exeter. But he foresaw the need of strengthening the Phillpotts' studentships on the side of fellowship, on which Theological Colleges are admittedly strong; and the Exeter plan would probably have attained a yet larger measure of success, if his recommendation that the students should be called together at intervals for joint instruction and intercourse had been carried out. Another point which he strongly urged was the introduction into the scheme of words laying stress on other qualifications besides those which could be tested by an examination on paper. To refer to his own words, he was most anxious that some evidence should be forthcoming that the students selected were likely, "from their high principle, their devotion to duty, their good sense, and their sympathy with others, to become truly useful clergymen."²

The same mind, bent on enlarging the outlook and raising the standard, both mental and religious, of the candidates, can be traced in all his own arrangements for the ordination and the steps

¹ *Chronicles of Convocation*, February 18, 1901. Cf. vol. ii. p. 342.

² Letter from Bishop Temple to the Dean and Chapter of Exeter, July 17, 1877.

preparatory to it. Eventually, when the prominent clergy of his diocese became better known to him, he included one or more of the Archdeacons (Woollcombe, Sanders, Earle) among his Examining Chaplains; but so strong was his sense of his individual responsibilities as to those whom he ordained, that at first he relied exclusively on the help of his own personal friends. Dr. Benson and Canon Cook aided him in the conduct of his primary Ordination Examination, and the post of Examining Chaplain was subsequently filled, first by the Rev. A. G. Butler, Fellow of Oriel, and afterwards by Dr. Percival, the present Bishop of Hereford; both of these men enjoyed his intimate friendship, and had been his colleagues at Rugby. The following extract from a letter to Canon Cook gives his view in the matter :—

RUGBY, *December 10, 1869.*

'The Examining Chaplain ought to be very intimately known to the Bishop, for, as you know, the Bishop, not the Chaplain, is really responsible. The Chaplain ought to be the Bishop's eyes and ears for the examination. . . . The duty is in reality personal rather than official. . . . I know that it would be a popular thing to appoint . . . but I am rather bound, I think, just now to let popularity follow on right, not to seek popularity, even in permissible ways.

In the character and conduct of the examination itself, the same robustness of mind and elevation of aim were conspicuous. The examination was not confined to formal theology. True to the conviction that the Anglican clergyman's ultimate appeal is to the individual conscience, and that the Bible is the supreme authority over conscience, and its best teacher,—impressed, moreover, with the belief that while books about the Bible were much read, the Bible itself was not studied,—he made it the staple of the examination, seeking to saturate the candidates, as far as possible, not

only with the knowledge, but with the spirit of the Scriptures. The papers on pastoral theology were set by the Bishop himself, and the following is given as a characteristic instance of his insight into spiritual life, and of his knowledge of the practical requirements of the clerical calling :—

1. What are the advantages of a periodical system of visiting people in their own homes? How can such a system be best organised and worked?

2. What are the legal duties of an incumbent as regards the sick, and as regards the children in his parish? Comment on the due discharge of these duties.

3. Give an account of the part that you take in parochial school work. What Rubrics and what Canons bear on the question?

4. What is the difference between careless people and thoughtless people, and how are we to deal with each?

5. What kind of teaching is generally best for the sick?

6. Explain the relation of Confirmation to Baptism.

7. By what arguments would you endeavour to persuade a young man to be confirmed and to come to the Holy Communion?

8. Describe your method of preparing candidates for Confirmation.

9. How would you deal with a man who abstained from Holy Communion, (a) from superstitious fear, (b) from carelessness about religion, (c) from consciousness of secret sin?

10. How do you prepare your sermons?

11. What is the law respecting the election, the duties, and the powers of churchwardens?

It was no slight advance in the ordinary practice of thirty-six years ago that from the first the candidates were entertained at the Bishop's Palace. Soon the examinations were divided into two sections separated by an interval of some weeks—an anticipation of the now ordinary practice—and to the latter part only those were admitted who had passed the previous examination in mental qualifications. It was exclusively devoted to the spiritual side of the preparation. The Bishop, for

the most part, gave the addresses himself, and they stand out as the main feature of the whole period, things which in many cases left an indelible impression on those who heard them. Passing over all subsidiary subjects, with slight reference even to the official duties of the clergyman, without rhetoric, with no appeals to sentiment, with no use of the imagination, he went straight to the main point—spiritual preparation; and even here there was no premature demand. It was the first stage of spiritual life that was mainly dealt with, renunciation, the resolve to war against sin within. The words had the power of the Word of God in them, ‘piercing even to the dividing asunder of the joints and marrow, and discerning the thoughts and intents of the heart.’ ‘Better,’ so spoke the stern voice, ‘that you should turn back even now at the last moment than that you should make a false presentment of yourselves before God at your ordination.’ And some did turn back. In all such utterances Frederick Temple had thought of himself; the measure which he meted out to others he had long ago meted out to his own conscience; and he was not always sensible how searching and scorching his words were, and that weaker men could not well endure the treatment to which he had subjected his own strong soul. In later years, when speaking in Convocation on the subject of the preparation of candidates for Holy Orders, he alluded to these withdrawals, but scarcely as one who realised what the force of his own personality had been :—

I think that the increase in the number of those who show that they really have the vocation for the ministry is marked, because I think that there were some who came forward to be ordained who did so from motives that hardly justified their ordination. I always had some conversation individually with the men who came forward, as of course

every one of you has, and I remember that when I was Bishop of Exeter it happened once or twice that when I urged on a man that he would be obliged to say that he had a call to the ministry, the result was that the man withdrew and declined to be ordained. It was not that I put the call to the ministry as anything that was really out of reach, as if it were a supernatural call; but when I put it so low as to say that a man ought not to consider himself called unless, on review of his own character and circumstances and aims in life, he could honestly say that he conscientiously believed that the work of the ministry was the work which God intended him to do here in this present world, some at the very last moment have withdrawn. I do not find now that there are men who are staggered by having that view put before them, but I did find it again and again in former years.¹

Some there were' who could not bring themselves to the great surrender; they went away sorrowful. The effect on others of a nobler mould may be best illustrated by the recollections of one of them:—

These are a few rough notes that I made at the time of the addresses given the evenings before my Ordination as Deacon and Priest. They seem to me now so very rough, and the connexion, alas! has so entirely passed away from my mind, that I can hardly conceive that they will be any help to you. But short as they are, they are very characteristic of the man. They have lived in my purse—or rather successive purses—ever since, *i.e.* for thirty years or more.

(1) Truth. Make the inner life at least as high as the outer.

Never preach anything that you have not yourself experienced.

(2) Live ever in close communion with God. Let every act be habitually referred to His decision.

(3) Try and live a spiritual life, to which the greatest helps are the study, (*a*) of the Bible, (*b*) of the works and lives of holy men.

(4) Give up your own will, your own prejudices, your own desires, whether in themselves right or wrong, to what will

¹ Chronicles of Convocation, July 1900, p. 367.

advance God's word in that particular spot where you are placed.

June 8, 1873.

(1) The call of the Spirit necessary. Test: Love of the Lord—"Lovest thou Me?" "Feed my sheep"—Is this the leading principle of whole life? Without this none should enter the ministry.

(2) Self-discipline. The negative side: "I keep under my body." Most essential. A secret sin unfought against will most assuredly—though we may know it not till too late, perhaps not at all—infect those with whom we have spiritual dealings. Then positive side equally essential. Ever constant communion with God. Other men deadened by absence of religious duties, we by very presence. Force yourselves to be in earnest.

(3) Study of Bible and Prayer. Essentials of spiritual life. Both must be regular. Sometimes we see men who began well, now cold, worldly. Why? They neglected these. Sometimes we see one of few intellectual attainments and naturally hard, become soft, gentle, with almost instinctive apprehension of meaning of Bible passages. Why? Because he has been careful in these. Do not neglect them.

February 21, 1875.

Perhaps the notes help to explain what followed, and the store that was afterwards set by them.

I shall never forget my interview with him on the night before my Ordination as Priest, when, after every one else had gone to bed, I stole up to his room to tell him that I did not think I ought to be ordained. It was a wonderful revelation, both of the loving gentleness that underlay his rough exterior, and of his true wisdom in dealing with souls. He saw that I was overwrought, and his last words were, "Now mind you never make a confession of this sort again."

It is natural that the writer should thus sum up his recollections:—

The thing which stands out most clearly in my recollection of the Ordinations is the extraordinary force and directness of the appeal that was made to one's conscience, and yet, at the same time, the exceeding tenderness and sympathy with which the wounded conscience was dealt

with, when the sledge-hammer blows had battered it into a regular pulp of self-reproachfulness.

There was another aspect of the Bishop in his dealings with men. And different sides appealed to different natures. A certain grim humour was never far away, even in solemn moments, as the following incident will show :—

A candidate for ordination ushered into the library. His Grace seated.

Archbishop : "Sit down." A long interval—five minutes perhaps, at the end of which time the Archbishop adjusts his glasses and picks up the candidate's papers. "Why didn't you fill in the answers properly?"

Candidate mildly protests that he thought he did.

Archbishop : "No, you didn't. You were asked to put down your name, your address, and your age. Here's your name—and that's on the wrong line—now where's your age?" (Collapse of candidate—grim smile from His Grace.) "Take this" (a New Testament), "go to the end of the room, read 1 Cor. xv., beginning at the 35th verse."

Candidate reads till stopped.

Archbishop : "That will do. Now why did you read the 36th verse wrong?"

Candidate protests—energetically this time.

Archbishop : "But I tell you, you did. Can you read Greek?" (Hands New Testament in Greek.) "Now read the verse."

Candidate : "*ἄφρων, σὺ ὁ σπείρεις,*" etc.

Archbishop : "Now read the English again."

Candidate does so.

Archbishop : "Why, you've read it wrong again!" After some painful minutes His Grace explains it is a matter of emphasis on the personal pronoun. "Thou fool, that which '*σὺ*' *thou thyself* sowest. And if you read it as you did, the whole argument is spoiled."

Candidate, now reduced to a proper state of humility, apologises for the error, and says he hasn't noticed the point before, whereupon—

Archbishop : "No, and 99 out of 100 clergymen read it wrong. And there's a special word '*σὺ*' to make it more emphatic too, and that shows you that before reading the lessons you ought first to read them in the Greek." (This

prospect has its difficulties, so candidate, who has now recovered somewhat, asks what the Revised Version has to say.)

Archbishop: (In a tone not altogether of satisfaction)—“You can look” (but displays little interest in the result).

Candidate (mildly): “Wouldn’t it be helpful if the lessons were read in the Revised Version, and the congregation followed with the Authorised Version, so that they could note the different readings?”

Archbishop: “They’d only think you read very badly.”—(and drops the subject). “Now sit still, and turn to Isaiah xxxvii. 21, and read.”

Candidate reads: “Whom hast thou reproached?”

Archbishop: “Who is thou?”

Candidate reads: “And this shall be a sign unto thee.”

Archbishop: “Who is thee?” etc., etc., and goes on to explain that the chapter is an example of the difficulties attached to the reading of the Old Testament—the constant change of personality of those addressed, or speaking. “And to make it worse the Queen’s printers have not discovered the use of inverted commas.” (Speaks of the chapter as “most difficult.”) “Turn to Psalm xi.”

Candidate reads: “In the Lord put I my trust.”

Archbishop: “Who is I?”

Candidate: “David, I suppose” (continuing), “How say ye to my soul.”

Archbishop: “Who are ye?” and so on to show change of speaker. He then reads the Psalm himself—magnificently—in answer to candidate’s question whether he considered it possible to bring out this difference in ordinary reading—and also describes how there were many portions of the Old Testament preserved by tradition before being committed to writing, and how a man would enter a village and stand on a raised place and repeat the Psalms, etc., and would denote the different speakers by action, or turning hither and thither, or by greater change of voice than ordinary reading allows of. Suddenly: “Would you want to be ordained if you had £50,000 a year?”

Candidate cannot contemplate such a possibility, and says so.

Archbishop: “Now what have you been thinking about all these years? You haven’t been thinking about Theology—you’ve been thinking about Natural Science.”

Candidate (now getting desperate) says he has, and means to think of it and go on doing so—and to his surprise

Archbishop: "And quite right too" (rises).

Archbishop: "Have you any idea of the difference between the ministry and every other profession?"

Candidate—who it must be remembered has not yet become accustomed to shape his thoughts on such matters into words, and especially in such company—struggles to do so.

Archbishop: "Yes—that's so. But there's one great distinction which you haven't mentioned." (With a grim twinkle.) "You can get out of any other profession if you don't like it. You *CAN'T* get out of the ministry. Now, will you give me the names of three clergymen, etc. I want *names*, understand—not letters—because they'd write what you wanted them to write." Interview drawing to a close.

Candidate has, unfortunately, not taken Theology at Cambridge and fears the "Preliminary." Hoping he has made a favourable impression, but not daring to ask to be excused the examination, he says tentatively as he picks up his hat, "Then I suppose I shall have to pass the Preliminary Examination?"

Archbishop (now seated at his desk again and without turning round): "Yes."

Candidate is just at the door, retiring gracefully, when the Archbishop's concluding remark shoots him out—

"IF YOU CAN,"

and completes a forty minutes' experience which the candidate will always treasure.

The incident belongs to a later period of the life, when the Bishop's sense of humour was, perhaps, more frequently in evidence; it is recorded here because it is connected with the subject in hand, and is typical—illustrating the quickness with which he read his candidates, and taught his lessons incidentally. Such experiences were somewhat appalling, but useful if the patient could receive them; in this case, being wise, he pondered and understood.

But the *full* understanding was for those who had gained from earlier years the knowledge of what lay beneath that rough exterior.

It was simply love for the Dr. (writes the first of Dr. Temple's Rugby pupils ordained by him) that took me

down to Devonshire to continue my pupilage under my old master. It is certain that to him I owe a desire to enter Holy Orders, which was not a profession for which I was intended, nor with which I had any special connexion. I do not think that Dr. Temple consciously sought to influence a boy's life in the direction of Holy Orders; in fact, I feel sure he did not. But he inspired boys to follow out his teaching in a calling such as his own. He never would have encouraged a boy to enter the ministry of the Church as a *profession*, but he did make him feel it was a noble *vocation*. So it was that in 1870, the year following Dr. Temple's consecration, I went down to the Palace at Exeter on a visit, and found that the Bishop and his sister were the same true friends as in the old days. The warm grip of the hand, the old, straight, searching look were there again. How difficult those early days in the Exeter Diocese must have been for the Bishop and Miss Temple we could in a measure feel. How loyal to him, and how proud of him we youngsters felt, as week by week the Bishop won his way and turned opponents into disciples, and hostile critics into admirers. At my Ordination as Deacon and Priest (1871-72) I well remember the earnestness of the Bishop's short addresses at the evening services held in the Palace Chapel during the Ember week. I have vivid recollections, also, of the men who gathered round that long table in the Palace dining-room.—Chancellor Benson, who examined in the early days of Dr. Temple's Episcopate; Canon Cook, then engaged on the Speaker's Commentary; the then Sir Stafford Northcote, maliciously suggesting to the learned scholar that "tepeo" was the probable derivation of tea-pot; Prebendary Bramley, who once got the Bishop to preach in his church, and gave no notice of his coming, so that he should see the ordinary congregation and no more; my own dear good Vicar, Leopold Acland of Broadclyst; and then the Bishop's old master at Tiverton, Prebendary Sanders, a very Tory of the Tories, and brimful of kindness and fun, between whom and his old pupil there was a constant interchange of friendly political repartee. Only one of the inner circle of those early Exeter days still remains,—Ernest Sandford, the Chaplain, old Rugbeian like myself.

Mine is, perhaps, a unique experience—to have been present at the Consecration Service in Westminster Abbey, and to have knelt by the side of the simple coffin with its purple pall through the long December night, thirty-two

years later, in the nave of Canterbury Cathedral. May the life and its lessons of thoroughness and duty never fade.¹

In order to diffuse throughout the diocese a fuller conception of the importance of the clerical office, and to let the people generally see and hear what the service itself was, Dr. Temple held Ordinations at different centres—Truro, Plymouth, Torquay, Launceston, Barnstaple. After the examination at Exeter, the candidates were conveyed to the appointed town, were lodged in the houses of the clergy and leading citizens, and were ordained in the Parish Church. Not a little was sacrificed, but much was gained. In the early years of Bishop Temple's Episcopate, the evident impression made upon the inhabitants, which strongly reacted upon those who were ordained, was a more living and lasting power than even the quiet atmosphere and sacred associations of the Cathedral. Perhaps the balance of gain and loss has shifted during a generation, but it is possible that an occasional recurrence to this practice might be useful.

¹ Memorandum from Rev. Laurence R. Whigham.

CHAPTER VII (*continued*)

THE BISHOP AND THE CLERGY

Ordinati

Patronage system—Discipline—Conferences with the clergy—
Visitation charges—Quiet days—Personal relations with the
clergy.

It is not difficult to gather from the Bishop's view of the preparation for Ordination what would be his relations with the clergy after it.

I. He quickly laid his finger upon the greatest external hindrance to the well-being of the parochial ministry, namely, the patronage system, and throughout his whole Episcopate of thirty-three years the recurrence to the subject was constant. He gave a hearty support, according to his wont, to all efforts to effect even a partial reform, and accepted, as an instalment, the Benefices Act of 1898, which abolished the sale of next presentations, and introduced many beneficial changes in the existing system of patronage. But his ultimate goal was the entire abolition of the sale of livings. All reforms, which stopped short of the ultimate goal, were to him merely steps on the journey. Minor evils in public affairs he would often tolerate, but with evils that touched vital interests he never abandoned his warfare. There is scarcely one of the charges delivered during the fifteen years of his Exeter Episcopate in which patronage is not a

prominent subject, and some of his strongest and most direct utterances were made during this period, either at conferences or visitations.

These are his first words :—

'The traffic (in the sale of livings) has unquestionably had the effect of inducing all concerned to disregard altogether the undeniable and most important fact that every patron is an officer of the Church, holding a most important office. A patron is an officer of the Church charged with a very serious and a very responsible duty—at present, indeed, responsible to God alone, but nevertheless responsible to Him in the most serious sense. A patron is entrusted with the duty of seeing that a fit man is appointed to take charge of the spiritual interests of a parish. . . . I believe the Church of England is absolutely the only Church in the world in which this hurtful traffic is still tolerated. Perhaps I may go on and say, it is not only the only Church in the world, but the only institution in the world; and in secular things men have already set themselves free from what they had found a very serious mischief. I cannot but hope that the time will come, and come before long, for the entire prohibition of all this traffic. I do not think that until that is done it will be possible to speak of the Church as free from a serious blot. . . . I believe it to be a duty of all who are interested in the welfare of the Church to study the question carefully, and to do their part towards the creating of public opinion of a healthy and high-toned character. And I shall think it my duty to take fitting opportunities of pressing the matter again and again upon the Church, in the hope that by slow degrees something may be effected, even though it be very little at the time, and even though nothing like a great or real improvement be very near. . . . I feel strongly on the matter, and believe it would be well worth while to pay even a very heavy price in order to get rid of what is a most serious scandal and does most serious mischief.¹

He returns to the attack in 1880, after the issue of the report of the Commissioners on the Sale and Exchange of Benefices :—

If we ask to what do all these recommendations amount,

¹ Charge of Bishop Temple, 1875.

and how far ought they to be welcomed by those who desire to purify the administration of the Church from every blemish, I think the answer must be, that if adopted by the Legislature they will unquestionably check many gross abuses, and make it far more difficult than at present to sacrifice the spiritual interests of Parishioners to the pecuniary interests of Patrons. But their indirect effect will be, in my judgment, far greater than their direct. Everything which tends to raise the position of the office, whether of Patron or of Parish Clergyman, will assuredly tend to make it felt more widely and more deeply how inconsistent such a position is with the sale of it either privately or publicly. Every restraint of the working of the system is of necessity a reproof of it; it expresses with increasing emphasis that the system left to itself is bad. It calls attention to the fact that it must be held in perpetual check. It indicates the mischief which is its natural outcome. A system which can only be tolerated when perpetually restrained cannot last long. . . .

One thing more yet remains to be said. I must not be supposed in anything that I have said, either to deny the right of the owners of advowsons to the full value of their property, or to blame them for having sought, or now seeking, to obtain that value. The system is ever one thing, the men another. . . . I blame the system, and the system only, and I hope that many will yet think as I do, who, nevertheless, have claims under the present system which they are unable to forego. Of this, at any rate, I am quite certain, that when once we have got rid of this system it will very soon be a matter of wonder how any could have been found to defend it.¹

The issue of the Report of the Commissioners soon began to have effect in the production of Bills in Parliament dealing with patronage, and in the following year (1881) the Bishop was able to say:—

. . . I do not believe that it will be possible, in the face of the discussion of the subject which has now begun and which cannot be checked, to maintain a law so full of anomalies. One or other of the two ideas must in the end prevail; and Patronage must, in the end, be either declared a property or a trust, and not both at once. If it is a property, the present

¹ Charge of Bishop Temple, 1880.

restraints are vexatious, and men should be allowed to buy preferment for themselves when it is vacant. If it is a trust, the sale should be forbidden altogether, as the sale of all other trusts has been forbidden. Either principle alone is perfectly intelligible, but the combination of the two is not. . . .

For myself I can see but one escape from the system, and that is, that Parliament should fix the proportion of the income that is equivalent to the patron's interest, and that the patron who desires it should be allowed to appropriate to himself as absolute property that proportion of the endowment of his benefice as soon as the benefice becomes vacant, and on doing so cease altogether to hold the advowson. The Church would, of course, be a loser by the amount thus abstracted by patrons surrendering their patronage, but the price would be well worth paying.¹

His final utterance on the subject in the Exeter Diocese was made in the Charge in the following year. He expresses approval of a Bill agreeing very nearly with his "own suggestions given some years back to a Select Committee of the House of Lords." The Bill went as far as to propose the abolition of the sale of advowsons "unless to the lord of the manor, or to an owner of land in the Parish producing twice the income of the benefice, or to some public patron who cannot sell again"; and it also provided "that any Patron may require the Bounty Office to purchase his Living for a sum not greater than half its market value"; with permission to the office to borrow and recoup itself with instalments out of the living.

He then concludes:—

Year after year, as it seems to me, we approach nearer to the abolition of a system which is indefensible in itself, and most mischievous in its consequences, which degrades the office of Parochial Minister, demoralises more or less every one that has to do with it, exposes the Church to well-founded attacks, seriously impairs her influence over a vast number of religious people, wounds the feelings of many of her most

devoted sons, and obscures the Divine character of her mission.¹

But, in spite of the hopeful anticipation of these words, the reform was long in coming; he had still to wait sixteen years² before Parliament passed a patronage measure; and even then the improvement was but limited. He could not wholly exonerate the clergy from blame, and he thought that they were infected by the moral evil of the system. In a pastoral letter, addressed to the clergy and laity, in 1879, he writes:—

One thing more I think it right to add; the real strength of the present system is in the support which it receives from the clergy. If the clergy were more decided in their disapproval of it, it would, undoubtedly, be far easier to deal with. I beg of my brethren to give the matter their thoughts. I know well what will be the inevitable, slow perhaps, but inevitable result of much stirring of this question in our minds.

To two other measures he also gave special support, with the same object of maintaining the efficiency and moral welfare of the clergy, as far as legislation could effect this result—the one was the Incumbents' Resignation Act of 1871, and the other the Pluralities Act Amendment Act of 1885. His action in regard to the patronage question was a marked example of the patient pertinacity with which he followed up essential reforms; his Diocesan administration of the Incumbents' Resignation Act illustrated his anxiety always to combine justice to the individual with thought for the body, and to show his consideration for those who had

¹ Charge of Bishop Temple, 1882.—It will be seen from the references to Bishop Temple's Charges in this and the previous pages that they were delivered in consecutive years. In the latter part of his Exeter Episcopate it was his custom to spread the usual triennial visitation over three years, taking one Archdeaconry a year, and visiting conjointly with the Archdeacon.

² Benefices Act, 1898; also "Primacy" Memoir, vol. ii. p. 352.

grown old in the service of the Church. He brought all his legal ability to bear on individual cases in which he thought the general laws bore hardly, and spared no amount of detailed labour in their settlement. Many of those who reaped the benefit of his pains in this and kindred matters—such, for instance, as appeals to Societies and Commissioners—will perhaps never fully realise the extent to which they are indebted to his interest on their behalf, and to the influence which his well-known justice and knowledge of affairs exercised with officials. His advocacy was a guarantee that no “job” was on foot, and that the plan proposed would work. An Exeter clergyman, who had been appointed to the charge of a new district, furnishes an illustration in this connexion :—

The Ecclesiastical Commissioners assigned an income of £280 to the benefice, and they also gave £1500 towards the erection of the vicarage. When I was at last admitted incumbent, the Bishop asked me how I was getting on, and, amongst other things, I necessarily told him about the endowment, etc. “Perhaps,” he said, “I had something to do with that.”

The Bill which was ultimately developed into the Pluralities Act Amendment Act, was carried through the House of Lords by the Bishop himself.¹ Though he was not actually its author, it bore very markedly the impress of his hand, its aim being to make more efficient provision for the appointment of curates in parishes suffering from the negligence or incapacity of incumbents. In this case also great pains were taken to safeguard individual claims, both moral and legal.

II. But in his effort to raise the standard of

¹ Charge of Bishop Temple, 1883, p. 23. It was piloted through the House of Commons by Mr. (now Sir C. T. D.) Acland, the eldest son of his old friend.

clerical duty the Bishop's main appeal was to deeper powers than external law. His reliance was not on regulation of conduct, but on education of character.

(1) In collective administration to that end, two principal agencies were Ruridecanal Conferences and Quiet Days. The former were mainly, though not exclusively, devoted to the practical, and the latter to the spiritual side of clerical life. The Quiet Days he conducted himself; in the Conferences he was the chief speaker, but his main object was to draw out the opinions of others. It would be hard to find a parallel in the history of the Anglican Episcopate for the diligence and regularity with which both were carried on, or to exaggerate their influence in widening the outlook, and in gradually raising the whole conception of the life of the parochial clergy. He began the Conferences in 1875,¹ holding them that year in the Archdeaconry of Cornwall, as well as in Devonshire. The first Quiet Day was held at Barnstaple on November 15, 1878.² Both were continued (the former annually) until the close of his Exeter Episcopate in 1885. For ten years the Exeter clergy enjoyed a quiet education of the highest kind in all the significance and opportunities of their office.

A reference has already been made in a previous chapter to the Ruridecanal Conferences as part of the organisation of the diocese;³ but it is desirable here to lay emphasis upon their influence as an educational power. The mere enumeration of some of the chief subjects discussed will suffice:—

As bearing on the liturgical and religious side of Church life the following may be mentioned:—

¹ Charge of Bishop Temple, 1875, p. 40.

² Memorandum from Rev. T. S. Rundle.

³ *Supra*, p. 355.

Baptism and the Sponsorial system.
 Confirmation and preparation for it.
 Holy Communion.
 Preaching.
 Reading in Church.
 The Offertory and Systematised Collections.
 Studies of the clergy.
 Religious instruction of the young.
 Sunday Schools, Guilds, and Adult Classes.
 Family Prayer.
 Missions in Country Parishes.

Under the category of subjects connected with Church economy generally, these topics came under discussion :—

Surplice Fees.
 Duties of Churchwardens.
 Seating in Church.
 Concerted action of the Clergy.
 Lay Assistants, official and general.
 Reform of Convocation.
 Lay Co-operation (Parochial, Diocesan, and Central).
 The National Church.

In the list of social subjects¹ were included :—

Thrift.
 Purity.
 The Young Men's Friendly Society.²

The following are the notes of his remarks on the subject of PREACHING :—

The subject divides itself into two parts—The Sermon itself; Delivery of Sermon.

The Sermon itself :—

The Bishop wished that it was not expected of the clergy to preach two or three sermons every week; that it was more the practice to read printed sermons; we should often teach people more, probably, in this way; but it needs courage to begin.

¹ For his comprehensive treatment of Temperance, *vide infra*, pp. 475-485.

² Many of these topics also formed the subjects of more detailed treatment in the Bishop's Visitation Charges.

A sermon, to be worth preaching, requires a good deal of preparation. Matter need not be, ought not to be, of necessity original. But the way of expression may be our own. It is a great mistake to strain after originality. This especial caution for younger clergy; as we get older we shall have more to say. But it is right for us still to be reproducing old teaching, suitable to our own time. We must learn so as to instruct. Commentaries, writers on kindred subjects, Latin and Greek writers, good—especially Augustine, Chrysostom, and again S. Gregory, who puts great moral truths in a striking light; so also many of our old English divines. Having got our material, we must then arrange it. The Bishop said he used to take *ten* hours; *now* he would always like to have *three* hours at least for preparation.

There was great need in these days of *expository* sermons. Clergy are not alive to this. People need the intellectual side—to know the meaning of the Bible; to have a good Commentary, not to read, but to listen to. This necessity arises partly from the intellectual activity of our times, which makes the spiritual life deficient unless the intellect is engaged. We must teach children dogmatically; but now people are demanding evidence, not content to be taught as children. Hence the Bible must be explained, and with much pains. Expository sermons, well prepared and illustrated, will be liked.

Again, these days are days of great excitement. People expect a great deal of emotion; it is often much mistaken, and hence often does harm;¹ it must have a corrective, and that is “knowledge”; “true, definite teaching.” Hence the great importance of exposition. It implies much care; it is *the* work now specially demanded of us.

Delivery of Sermon:—

It must be either without book, or with book. No one ought to preach a strictly extempore sermon. But suppose sermon prepared, is it to be delivered with book or without book?

No doubt, if it can be done well, *best without book*, especially with uneducated people. They derive benefit from gestures, tone, etc. The most effective sermon is one that has been written three or four times over, and then preached without book. All great orators have prepared,

¹ But *vide infra*, pp. 499-501.

learnt by heart, and then delivered. But this costs a great deal of time. By practice, words will come without writing.

Dangers of written sermons.

They are apt to be dull.

We get a stock of them; better make a rule to burn or to publish. A sermon, to be good, must represent your own feeling at the time. We ought to feel that we are called to live by what we recommend. We may fail, but we must try for it. Now, if we think an old sermon "will do," certainly it will not do;¹ unless, indeed, the old sermons are sermons of great learning, but these are not numerous.

Dangers of sermons preached without MS.

We shall ramble, or repeat, or forget ourselves. Remember "the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets."

People will admire us, and we get conceited. In primitive times the gift of tongues was thought to be best; so now. But S. Paul says "No," and puts this gift at the bottom.

We shall get a stock of words instead of belief and conviction. There is danger in fatal facility of expression, words with nothing behind. The true corrective is constant study.

The sermon is the proper opportunity for oratory; only one must always be master of oneself; gestures must be natural; we must avoid particular tricks; the physical requisites for preaching are much the same as for reading; we must attend to the pitch of the voice; not be too fast; aim at distinctness; but more may be allowed to powers of rhetoric than in prayer, and in reading the lessons. Some can produce more effect by quietness, deliberateness, etc., but these depend upon the individual. We must always remember we are giving God's message.

(There was then a brief discussion, after which the Bishop resumed.)

He thought *we* preached more to the conscience—dissenters more to the heart.

For expository sermons the Bishop suggested St. Augustine's expositions. In regard to the length of sermons, the Bishop thought the laity did not mind long sermons, and that we exaggerated the shortness.²

¹ Dr. Temple was not opposed to the use of old sermons provided they are "new to yourselves."

² Address of Bishop Temple at a Conference held at Exeter in 1884—a transcript of notes taken at the time by one of the clergy (Rev. E. I. Gregory, Rural Dean, now Prebendary of Exeter Cathedral).

The same subject had been dealt with in a somewhat more formal manner in the Visitation Charge of 1880 :—

The last subject on which I desire to speak on the occasion of this Visitation is that of preaching. I do not think that even yet the power and utility of preaching, or perhaps I may say, of what our preaching might be and ought to be, is sufficiently appreciated. Educated people are not at all good judges of what preaching is to the less educated. Educated people have already read or heard almost all that sermons can tell them, if we except the sermons of men much above the average mark ; and they are apt to think that average sermons are no more to others than to themselves. But less educated persons can learn, and do learn, a great deal from sermons. They get new knowledge, new thoughts, new methods of thought, and they get all this in the best way, that is, unconsciously. The people, as a rule, find a sermon more to them than the prayers, and that is not caused by any self-indulgent desire to seek what pleases them. It is the free judgment of their spiritual experience. They are not at the intellectual level at which prayers, except very short and specific prayers, can give them the help which they can get from good teaching in the form of sermons.

Now, I wish to point out that the sermons which are most needed are precisely those which every one of us would be best able to give, if only we would take the necessary pains—I mean sermons to explain passages of Scripture. . . . It requires a good deal of reading, and a good deal of thinking, and a good deal of writing. But in this kind of sermon, taking pains will enable us to do really useful work. . . .

And our best and most religious people are hungry for knowledge of the Bible. The more education spreads and people can read for themselves, the more do they want to understand that book. It is in attacking that book that sceptics attack religion. It is in explaining that book that teachers make the deepest impressions—false teachers in spreading error, and true teachers in building men up with the truth. The deeply religious, the inquiring, the unhappy, the perplexed, they all go to the Bible for what they want. We can hardly do anything, I doubt if we *can* do anything, for our people to be compared with helping them to understand the Bible ; and sermons especially directed to that

end will fall in with their need better than almost any other sermons. A clergyman will do very good service who will go carefully over one of the Gospels, explaining everything in consecutive order; telling also who wrote it, and as nearly as possible when; showing the structure of it, the main divisions of it; above all, explaining in order the connexion of each part as it is reached with the parts that have preceded. We have all read the Gospels in this way ourselves; we have studied them paragraph by paragraph; we have been guided in doing so by men who knew more than we did. Our people would be the better if we would give them the guidance that we have received. I do not mean that we are to do nothing else; but I believe that many of us would find that if a third of our sermons were turned into lessons of this kind, we should satisfy our people far better than we do. There are very many who would gladly bring their Bibles and follow our comments with the book open before them; and those who could not read would listen very attentively while we read first and explained afterwards.

Now, of course, we have much to do, and work of this sort takes up time, and a man may very often find that he has not time to make two sermons for every Sunday, one of which shall be of this kind; and he must, therefore, sacrifice his other sermons, his hortatory or doctrinal sermons, if he is to do what I am recommending. And this leads me to a further recommendation which I desire to give my brethren, and that is, that they should not be ashamed openly and avowedly to use good sermons written and published by others. I do not believe that any clergyman would lose the respect of his parishioners if he began a sermon by saying, "I am going to read to you a sermon written by such and such a man"; he might add something of the man's history, just to let his people know to what they were listening, and he might mention whether he read the whole of it or only selections, and whether he had inserted or appended remarks of his own. The one objection to preaching other people's sermons is the want of perfect truthfulness, if we lead our people to suppose that what we are giving them is our own when it is not. If our people thoroughly understand what we are doing, they will certainly be quite as ready to listen to good sermons which we have chosen for them, as to inferior sermons which we have written for them. There will still remain a good deal that must be our own; and

thoroughly good expository sermons such as I have described already we must compose, because we shall not find them ready-made. But we may be sure that in teaching our people we shall gain and not lose by being manly and open, and not pretending to do what none but very few can do, and what we are not at all the better clergymen for being able to do, that is, being able to write two fresh sermons every week.

But I must add that I do not think, as a rule, that we take pains enough with our delivery of what we have to say. It is essential to teaching of any kind that the teacher should study to make his hearers feel his sincere conviction, his fixed resolution to live, or to try to live, by what he is preaching, his serious earnestness, his fervent wish that all should understand the truth and lay hold of it. The foundation of good preaching is that the preacher lay to his heart what he is saying. If we are thinking, not of helping our people, but of the sort of figure we are making, if we allow ourselves to be self-conscious, if we do not try with all our strength to speak as in God's sight, as if the Lord Himself were hearing all that we said, we shall fail in reaching our people's consciences and hearts. The foundation of good preaching is in the preacher's own self-surrender to what he is saying. And as this is the way to reach the conscience and the heart, so in order to reach their understandings we must first have our own understandings clear. If we are going to preach a sermon of our own composing, we must study until we know what we are going to say. We must be clear in our own minds, or we shall never be clear to the minds of our hearers; and this requires a great deal of pains to be taken. It may be that we have not the gift of expressing ourselves readily, even when we do know what we mean; but we can write what we mean, and rewrite it until we have satisfied ourselves, and no pains taken for this purpose will be thrown away. And so, too, if you mean to make another man's sermon effective, you must take pains first to thoroughly understand it, and then to be careful in reading it. It is well worth while to take much trouble to make ourselves both audible and pleasant to listen to; it is well worth while to cultivate distinctness of utterance, earnestness, and liveliness of manner. It is possible to spoil very good sermons by reading them in a dull or slovenly way, by being too rapid or too monotonous, by false cadences, wrong emphasis, or frequent mistakes and corrections of those

mistakes. All these things may seem small matters in comparison with the solemn nature of our duties; but they are not small, because they have a considerable effect on the result of our labours. We are serving God. In His service all things that help forward our great mission are of importance.

Very suggestive is what he says at Halberton, in 1884, on READING IN CHURCH :—

The Bishop said :—

The physical conditions of good reading, though not of the highest importance, were yet of considerable importance.

The reading should be *loud enough*; the younger generation of clergy were not loud enough; it was needful for uneducated people.

There should be the *right pitch of voice*; this varies from church to church; voice is often drowned in echo; new buildings are harder than old.

Management of the breath: never allow it to be exhausted; breathe through nostrils.

Speed: necessary to adapt pace to the building; a smaller building admits of more rapidity.

Distinct articulation, especially of the consonants. These things cannot be attended to in church; all this ought to be done mechanically; we want to know our own defects; this is not easy; we should get a candid critic; we must practise.

The intellectual qualification of good reading.—It is necessary to understand what we read; original sources often throw great light on the meaning; find out where phrases come from in the Bible. Particularly true in the reading of the lessons that we should understand them; it is well to read them over beforehand; we shall almost always find something new; that is characteristic of the Bible. In the Old Testament all the more necessary because of the dramatic character of the writing; the perpetual shifting of Character; look at Prophets, Job, Ecclesiastes, Deuteronomy.

There are two distinct schools of reading in this respect: *simple*, like the reading of a well-taught child; for the prayers, the Bishop preferred it. Best reader Bishop ever knew was John H. Newman,¹ whose whole manner was

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, p. 65, and Editor's Supplement, vol. ii. p. 445.

penetrated with reverence, as if he were learning; but it is doubtful if all could read in this way: it may degenerate into monotony. *Rhetorical*: aims at giving full meaning; calls in aid of intonation, manner, etc.; has tendency to degenerate into preaching. The best reading is the most natural.

Spiritual conditions of good reading.—We must not think whether we are reading well or ill. Remember our first duty is to worship ourselves, not only to lead the devotions of others. Prayers ought not to be said to the people, but to God: characteristic of such reading is reverence and humility, which will be there, if in the heart first. We should be conscious of the presence of others who are joining with us in prayers. In the lessons we are speaking to the people; we must always try to make the people feel that the lessons are God's Word; remember it is a message from God, and then read in a natural way.

We should not trouble about the instrument (our voice) which we have to use, but do the best we can.

What are the chief faults or temptations which may beset us?

Conceit or vanity. No merit will make up for the demerit of vanity.

Slovenliness. A more widely spread temptation, arising from nervousness or dread of affectation. There is danger also from idleness.

There is a growing desire in the Church of England for more music.—This is undoubted; not so much, perhaps, for intoned, as for monotoned services; really good monotoning keeps out certain temptations, such as to preach the prayers, and it is easier; it is best when uneducated people don't recognise it. We should guard against being artificial, but very often it is a very effective way of rendering the service, often leads to better responding.

In conclusion the Bishop said: Take care of small details of the service. "The Lord be with you" is, perhaps, not thought of enough, as a change in the service. The human voice is intended to reach the heart.¹

The subject of CLERICAL STUDY was handled both at Conferences and in Charges. It would be difficult to find advice more tersely or forcibly expressed than this:

¹ From notes taken at the time by Rev. E. I. Gregory, Rural Dean.

Finally, I desire to point out that, if the clergy are to be the true instructors of the people, they must, all their lives long, persist in seeking instruction themselves. I speak of this the more earnestly because I do not think it possible for any bishop to have much to do with the younger clergy, and with those who seek ordination at his hands, without perceiving that we run a very serious risk of losing that which has hitherto been one of the great glories of the English Church, namely, that her clergy has been for the most part a learned clergy, students of the Bible and well instructed in it. I cannot but notice that there are increasing difficulties in the way of true study. The increased demands made upon the clergy in their parochial work, the demand for more visiting, the demand for more frequent services, and that those services should be of a much more exhaustive character, press upon the clergy very heavily; and there is a perpetual temptation to under-rate the importance of study, and to think that a clergyman is justified in setting it entirely aside in order to attend to his parish. Of course the different kinds of work the clergy have to do have their claims upon them in their proper order, but I am satisfied that nothing they have to do is of so much importance as to justify them in disusing their study of the Bible, even for a single day. I notice that this difficulty presses most hardly upon those who are really in earnest in the desire to do their duty, and upon those who have the deepest sense of the responsibility of their ministry; and all the more is it my duty to insist upon the importance of that which is the essential condition of all the rest of the work being done well, namely, unremitting and careful study throughout life. Every one who has had any experience of the matter knows that it is very difficult, indeed, to resume study if it has long been disused; and if the younger clergy lose the habit of steadily pursuing their study of the Word of God, the Church will hereafter most seriously suffer, and it will then be too late to supply the necessary remedy. I am quite sure that not only the work we have to do in the instruction of the people, but also our endeavours to reach the people's hearts, and stir their feelings, will, to a very great extent, depend for their success upon the degree in which our own minds are penetrated with the power of God's Word. In the course of years a man's preaching suffers very seriously—all the more seriously because he himself, very likely, does not notice the gradual deterioration—if he allows himself to fancy that he

already knows enough, and that all he has to do is to communicate that which in his early days he had stored up in his mind. Nothing can be a greater mistake, and I am certain that when a clergyman of mature years is complained of as being dry or dull, a complaint that we sometimes hear, it arises much more often from the fact that he has disused the quiet and living study of the Bible than from any other cause. In these days when the knowledge of the Bible is of such paramount importance, when it is a protection on the one side against disbelief of religion altogether, and on the other side against religious fervour degenerating into mere excitement and emotion, it is impossible to overrate the importance of making the study of it by our people, living, real, and thorough; and unless we ourselves are students all the time, we must fail in all such endeavours. . . . But it is not only to the younger clergy that I would speak, because unless their seniors feel the importance of this matter, and make it their business to aid and encourage those who are younger than themselves, very little can be done simply by the exhortation of the Bishop, delivered, as it must be, on rare occasions, and sure to be thrust aside by the pressure of ordinary work. Much can be done by the clergy joining together for the purpose of study, and by occasional meetings for the purpose of hearing each other's conclusions and conferring on parts of the Bible previously read. In many parts such meetings of the clergy have been already held, and I would urge that they should be more frequent, and that every one should be encouraged to make some direct preparation for them, because it is upon such preparation that the advantage of any such conference almost entirely depends.

As the character of the study should be such that the results of it may be used in the instruction of others, it is well also to bear in mind that the Scripture—and that for a very natural reason—is always its own best commentator. More particularly is this the case in the study of the New Testament, the writers of which certainly wrote with the most extraordinary fulness of knowledge of the Old. They had the phrases, they had the lessons, they had the doctrines, they had the history of the Old Testament fresh and living in their minds; whenever they wrote it was perfectly clear that they had all these in the background, and the more a man studies the New Testament with the Old fresh in his mind, the better able will he be to enter into its meaning

and the relations of its parts. For this and similar reasons the study of every part of the Bible tells directly on the study of every other part. A student of the Bible should be perpetually comparing Scripture with Scripture. And the more familiar he is with Biblical language and Biblical forms of thought, the more progress will he make in understanding every fresh portion of the Bible on which he enters. And what is best for his study will be best also for the teaching of his people. By God's providence it has come about that the religious book with which the Church has made our people most familiar is the Bible. . . . And he who would instruct them must constantly make use as much as possible of Biblical language. Let me urge upon those who have to teach, the advantage of following in such a matter the example set by a great leader of the early Church to whom we owe the Nicene Creed. It is a characteristic of that Creed, that although it was necessary to gather the faith of the Church into such expressions as would suit the time at which it was drawn up, yet there is but one single word in the whole of it that is not taken straight out of the Bible. And so, too, in all our instruction, it should be our endeavour, as much as possible, whilst using what is given to us by other writers, ancient and modern, to cast our teaching into such a form that a man who has read the Bible, and made it the chief source of his own private study, will be able to follow thoroughly all that is told him and to constantly find the confirmation of our teaching in his own private reading. . . .

The Church of England, beyond any other Christian body in the country, has everything to gain by careful and earnest study. The sobriety, the quietness, and the calmness of the services of the Church, the very large amount of God's Word that is constantly used in every such service, the degree in which almost every prayer therein contained is full of Biblical instruction as well as of Biblical language, are quite certain, if we could but use all these aright, to attract all whom we most wish to attract, in proportion as they study the Word of God and drink in its spirit. We are pastors and we are teachers, but in the present day the teacher is the character that the clergy ought to value most highly and use most largely. For this is the great need of our time.¹

The subject of Family Prayer was congenial to him as bearing on the home life. He discussed it with his clergy in all the Rural Deaneries, and in the course of the discussion he recommended that the clergy should speak about it at marriages and baptisms, that they should circulate good forms of Family Prayer, and instruct their people how to use them. The discussion which he inaugurated in his own diocese led to further action on his part in Convocation.¹

One of the results of the Conferences was to bring out the wide range of the Bishop's knowledge, and to inspire increasing confidence in the soundness of his judgment. He became to his clergy, as he had been to his pupils, a general referee on every kind of subject. The Conferences had made it plain that, intimate as was his knowledge of the secular side of clerical life, it was not confined to this; and eventually it became as natural to go to him for advice on spiritual matters as on others. A striking illustration is the invitation to direct Quiet Days for the Clergy. Recognising that spontaneity is the essence of real success in such movements, he did not himself inaugurate them, but when the request came he responded. His addresses at Quiet Days were probably the highest expression of Bishop Temple's character, and produced a deeper and more permanent effect on the clergy than did any other work of his Episcopate; but their effect was not a little due to the self-diffidence with which he made the effort. His first utterance in his first address was a simple expression of doubt as to his personal capacity for such undertakings. He had hesitated, he said, but to refuse was to lower the conception of the Episcopate, and loyalty to his office compelled consent. Spiritual reserve

¹ *Infra*, pp. 569-571.

was characteristic of him; he had a natural unwillingness to unbare the soul. "Virtue" came out of him while he spoke, and like all truest virtue it was wrung out. The rugged force of his words had nothing in common with the facile flow of self-complacence; they did not even express the continuous current of days "Bound each to each by natural piety"; they spoke of self-mastery won by self-discipline, sometimes of a strong man's battle not yet finished, and there was that in the eye and voice which told its own tale. The general subjects followed the lines of his first Ordination sermon—the Christian minister, Christ's ambassador; the minister was wholly Christ's, and the aim for him was not respectability, but that highest life which implied self-sanctification and constant pressing forwards through union with the Lord.

The addresses at Barnstaple,¹ November 15, 1878, give the keynote—

S. John xvii. 17-19.—"Self-consecration after the example of Christ."

The power in all such meetings as these, and indeed in all our ministry, is a form of the communion of saints. There is a current of common spiritual life pervading the whole body transmitted from the Head, even as He received it from the Father. That which was in Him passed on to His hearers, that which is in us passes on to our people, that which is wanting in us will be wanting in our people. All the labour is not of so much value as the secret self-conquest. Where we fail, the failure could often be traced home, not to lack of learning or eloquence; it is really due to a lack of constant communion with God, of which Christ was an example. We must find means of sanctifying ourselves; otherwise all else will be of little avail. The thought of it should be with us now. Self-examination and prayer, a necessary preliminary; and then meditation on Christ's excellency and love,—we need to lose ourselves in Him.

¹ Prebendary Pigot's Memorandum, *supra*, p. 358.

What is this self-sanctification? There are three aspects of it. First, that spirit which consists in setting before ourselves a *high ideal and perpetually straining after it*. Turn to the example of our Lord—that strange and awful revelation which it is impossible to read without dread. (Heb. v.) “Who in the days of His flesh . . . though He were a Son yet learned He obedience.” How strange the possibility of His having to learn! Of all mysteries of the Incarnation, this the most wonderful, how completely he became man. So, too, S. Paul, “I keep under my body, etc.” Apply this to ourselves as ministers. There is a constant tendency to settle down, to be contented with ourselves. Nothing hinders our ministry more than this content. The old schoolmen called it sloth,—it is a snare to all. Not positive sin, but a low level. What is the spirit of our lives?—the general current of our thoughts? How much worldliness there can be without scandalising! Every now and then a sharp decision is necessary. What would you do if suddenly challenged with a demand for absolute self-surrender? How wanting we may be in industry and diligence, content with a lifeless discharge of our duties, giving little offence, while, perhaps, here and there is a soul perishing for lack of nurture. How greatly inclined we are to live far too easy a life. We recognise the beauty of the heavenly devotion of some saint—an ideal of unearthly goodness; but because it is an ideal we make no effort to attain it. Remember that this upward striving is the road to His love; it is the recollection of this high ideal through ordinary days of ordinary life which gradually lifts us higher, and it is this which gives power to our ministry. Who can fail to recognise the magic which resides in unearthly characters? It is this which reveals to others the power of God—this which by some subtle penetration seems to pierce into the hardest; even those who are most sunk often show a strange approbation of heavenly-minded men. On the other hand, we often fail for no reason we can trace, but simply because we have not within us this desire to ‘purify ourselves even as He is pure.’ What answering note can there be in the hearts of those who cannot find any sign in the speaker that he has himself obeyed the call to a higher life which he makes to others? If we are to be true to our ministry, this is the first condition—to learn the meaning of that deep repentance, that never-failing struggle which never loses hope that by God’s grace and love some

day the ideal shall be realised,—that we are seeking Him, and shall not fail.

The second aspect of self-sanctification is that by which a man is brought into contact with God. High ideals may attract those who are, nevertheless, not religious men, because they do not live in *communion with the Supreme Being*. There are instances among heathen systems of men's attempts to realise high ideals in their own strength. The Stoic belief is an attempt to live above humanity. Sure to fail. If such efforts be true the end is S. Paul's—"Who shall deliver me?" Morality, which is obedience to law, leads on of necessity to religion, which is devotion to a personal God. Abiding in the Lord is the keynote, the core of all spiritual life.

The highest expression of it in acts of devotion is Holy Communion. That Sacrament has no value except as penetrated by the power of the Atonement. We "show forth" the Lord's death as the source of our life on the one hand, and the great offering to the Father on the other. We desire to be taken up to Him, to receive from Him that eternal gift of which the death of Christ is the source, to offer all we have or are, purified and hallowed by the grace of Christ. Surely this is the spirit in which we have to live all day long. I do not speak of it as easy to do, or even to believe.

Nor is it easy to believe in prayer, which is another expression of the life which abides in God, in face of the apparent failure of our petitions. And yet, if any truth in revelation—whatever other difficulties, however strange and mysterious some articles of faith—here we stand on an immovable rock; prayer is heard and prayer is granted. This work of prayer is, more than we think, the work of the whole Church. Christian life is hid with Christ in God; underneath, moving in channels of which we know nothing, the hidden influence operates; and many a minister who has laboured long and never known outward success has assuredly been blessed, and his work will be one day visible. Moses did not enter Canaan, Elijah was taken away before the downfall of Baal; God will have us labour in dependence and prayer. And so the faithful minister of Christ, whilst labouring *among*, will, still more, labour *for* the people. His prayers will, day by day, go up to God. We must ask ourselves whether the spirit of prayer permeates all our labour

as it ought. How powerful is prayer for individuals! When we have to deal with each one by one, how surely must we plead for each one by one. When you visit a rich man remember him in your prayers; or a hardened sinner, or penitent, or an unbeliever who cannot see his way—all must be backed up by earnest prayer. Not long ago it became known, after the death of a well-known bishop, that it was his daily custom to pray for every priest in his diocese by name. Can we hear of it without a sense that this must have been a power to that man's ministry, far beyond anything due to personal gifts?¹ Such examples are given that we may know what spirit should rush into our hearts. No doubt I am only reminding you of known duties, but when we come to speak of these essential truths of spiritual life I cannot too earnestly impress on you that we cannot look too often to see whether, knowing that we ought to be men of prayer, our prayers are anything like what they ought to be, and whether, when we fail, it is not from want of prayer. Our Lord is the Vine, and we the branches. Does the sap flow? Are our souls perpetually turned towards Him? Or is it that our prayers are hasty, careless, and cold? Or, again, are they, as is more natural, unbelieving, with no true faith, with little of childlike simplicity and willingness to leave to Him to do what He will with our prayers? Meditate. God give us grace to find blessing, and make us a blessing to His people.

We come now to the third form or aspect of spiritual life—forgetting ourselves altogether, and *losing ourselves in contemplation of God*.^{*} I have put this aspect last, because I wish to finish with that which contains deepest peace. “I have prayed and striven long,” said a penitent, “and yet I have failed. How can I pray better?” “Go home,” was the saint's reply, “and pray for God's glory.” There is in such prayer a wonderful power to elevate the spirit; God and Eternity dwarf time and care; infinity makes our world nothing. The majesty and love of God are something more bright and glorious than we can conceive. How can we cast down—how rise above—some of those things which so vex us! We find the thought and contemplation of Him something that lifts us above them; we find that ideal which

¹ At this point the Bishop nearly broke down with intense feeling, and could hardly go on.

must be ever before our eyes. What is the moral standard but a reflection of God? And "Holiness," which we substitute for "Morality," comes from God. Does it not enlarge the soul, fire the heart, to seek holiness? The contemplation of these truths has a marvellous power to rob the world of its charms, and fill the soul with new influence and purpose. There is much to fight against, but the enemies are cast down by the knowledge of God.

And thus—in the knowledge and contemplation of God—we find deepest, surest peace. In striving, there is the pain of effort, failure, anxiety, grief, humiliation, sadness—how can it be otherwise? In all penitence there must be sorrow; when there comes with our petition still the knowledge of deep need, there is much to cause despondency.¹ In all our temptations, trials, work, there is trouble and disturbance; in the thought of God there is peace. His Eternal Majesty! The thought of it brings perpetual calm. If in our ministry, or in our lives, there is that which casts us down, shall we not forget it in His eternal purpose and in the thought of His unalterable love? In praise and study of Him there is pure happiness; what is life but 'to know Thee and Jesus Christ'? That knowledge is the perfect supply of all needs. Elsewhere we are all astray—at other times we are giving out; but in contemplation and praise we are receiving; and so it moulds our character. 'Now we see as in a mirror,' and yet, while so beholding, there is perpetual transformation. We are "changed into the same image." The power of such study sinks unconsciously into life, and, whilst blessing us, gives calm strength for all that will come.

Let me commend to you the contemplation of God as the great solace of life—as that which, beyond all else, will enable you quietly and steadily to persevere. In prayer there is often irrepressible emotion which seems to throw us off our balance; but here there is calm. Let us find rest in Him; let us make it part of our life to study Him—till we know Him better and better—till we approach His likeness by 'seeing Him as He is.'¹

A good commentary on the effect produced by the Bishop's clerical Conferences and Quiet Days is found in the following memorandum, written from

¹ From notes taken at the time by the Rev. R. Martin, Rural Dean, now Prebendary of Exeter Cathedral, and the Rev. T. S. Rundle.

the point of view of one of the younger clergy of the diocese :—

As to his Quiet Days for the clergy in the Palace Chapel, in no other way did he impress me as then. I have seen the tears roll down his face as he spoke of the love of God as manifested in the Incarnation, and I never wanted further answer as to his orthodoxy, and I have myself had ever afterwards a firmer grip of these vital truths.¹

(2) In speaking of the Quiet Days we pass into the inner chamber of clerical life ; and the transition from these is therefore easy to the Bishop's personal relations with individual clergy. Familiar intercourse was checked at first by brusqueness of manner, and some men fancied that the school-master was always hidden beneath the garb of the Bishop. But there probably never was an ecclesiastical ruler who had less of the official about him, and, if once his clergy had penetrated through the hard exterior, they found no barriers of social or professional etiquette to keep them off.

The only real obstacles were unreality, or pose, or any touch of falseness of character, in those who approached him ; no matter was too trivial, no detail too troublesome, to enlist the interest and sympathy of the Bishop when the personal footing had been established. The reality of the little incidents of everyday life gave them an interest in his eyes. Here is an instance :—

EXETER, *December 30, 1874.*

MY DEAR SANFORD—The smoking of the chimney has nothing whatever to do with the grate proper. The smoking is due either to the shortness, or the straightness, or to the openness at bottom of the chimney itself. The two former causes can only be dealt with by putting on a cowl. The last cause can only be dealt with by narrowing the mouth of the chimney above the fire.

¹ Memorandum from Rev. T. J. Ponting.

This can be done whatever grate you put in, though it is true that some grates are made with a register, or a valve at the top for this purpose.

I recommended the grate as giving most heat from least coals.

Narrow the flue over it, and it will not smoke.

He was as much at home in the business affairs of the parish as in the small things of the parsonage. Moreover, the subject of the following letter had its own special attraction, and always "drew" him :—

EXETER, *October 22, 1875.*

MY DEAR—,—I have looked into the law bearing on your right to close the public-house on your glebe, and I am quite satisfied that you can do it without fear of impeachment of waste. You are not bound to let the house at all; if you were to keep every house that there may be on the glebe unlet nobody could interfere with you, or afterwards complain; and if you let this to a tenant who does not use it as a public-house, the remedy of the next incumbent is to let it to some other tenant who will so use it. . . .

The Bishop's aptitude for legal questions, both great and small, was so marked as to have produced the remark about him credited to some public man: "Temple, it's a pity you are a clergyman; otherwise you'd have been Lord Chancellor." A sense of the soundness of his advice made him a constant referee to his clergy on all legal subjects. A collection of his answers on such questions, if it could be made, would be a clerical handbook of great value. The question of clerical fees was discussed at more than one of his clerical conferences. It is pleasant to know that action was taken in accordance with the sound and practical advice given in the following letter, and brought permanent peace to a parish which had long been disquieted, after the manner of country parishes, by this small financial trouble :—

EXETER, *June 21, 1875.*

MY DEAR SIR—No fees can be charged for burials, marriages, churchings, or the like, except on one of two grounds, either the custom of the parish (not of the diocese, nor of the neighbourhood, but of that particular parish), or a scale settled under Act 59 George III. ch. 134, § 11.

Mr. —'s neglect to take the fees would not destroy but would greatly weaken the evidence of custom. You would have to go back to his predecessor.

I think I should advise you to get a scale settled under the Act. It requires the consent of the vestry and of the Bishop. The Rural Dean and Archdeacons would be your best advisers how to proceed.

The following letters are full of sound judgment as to the general principles on which a parish is successfully managed :—

EXETER, *May 11, 1870.*

MY DEAR — . . . I have thought much of your matters since I saw you.

I think it unfortunate that you said anything whatever about not altering the seats. I think that you put yourself in a false position. You did not mean to bind yourself; but your words would mislead and probably did mislead.

I doubt, too, whether you were right in preaching in the surplice till you had got your people to consent. What harm would be done if you had preached in a gown for twenty years? And the result has probably been to make the proper rescating very difficult; and yet the seating is an important matter, and if that is postponed twenty years much harm is done.

All things considered I cannot but advise simply waiting.

You cannot give up on the question of seats; for the interests of the poor are at stake, and they are your special charge. But very likely the matter may wait without much mischief for a year or even for two. And patience will win.

The vestry and the place of the organ I look on as comparatively unimportant. It is, no doubt, best that the singing should be near the east end under the clergyman's eye. But the point is not vital.

I think if you waited and tried whether the offertory would help you, in a little time you might by mere patience and good-humour melt the opposition away. To do that would be worth a great deal.

Meanwhile, think whether you can retract in any matters that do not involve principle. The important thing is to show that you are not simply self-willed.

Anyhow, you will have a hard task. But I hope God will help you in it.

THE PALACE, EXETER, *April 20, 1871.*

MY DEAR ———,—The important matter is not to compromise the future. Leave the organ gallery, and promise, if it seems prudent, not to propose its removal for the present, or for ten years if they like; but decline to give any pledge that is to last for ever. So, if you are pressed about reading the offertory sentences, agree to have a hymn, but decline to say that you will never change: it is quite possible that both in this and in the former matter the parish may change.

The screen I should not care to keep at all. Screens do not really suit our services, and I should not care if they entirely disappeared.

The giving up the seats in the body of the church is a much more serious matter. In agreeing to this I think you ought to press very earnestly the grievous wrong of what sometimes happens, that the seats are very often either empty or half-full, and the persons to whom they are assigned act as dogs in the manger. It is impossible for any clergyman to press on his parishioners with real effect the duty of coming to church if he is liable to the answer, "There is no room for me if I do come." Those who have seats assigned to them ought to be willing expressly to agree that if they are not present at the service the unoccupied *sittings* may be filled up by the churchwardens for the occasion, and that if they cease to come their right to the seats ceases also. But, subject to such stipulations as these, I think your proposal¹ and Mr. ———'s may be accepted.

I think it important to notice that in any parish where Church rates have been given up the moral right of the rate-payers as against the body of the parishioners is plainly given up with it.

The assignment of the seats beforehand seems to me a good idea.—Yours affectionately,

F. EXON.

Relations with Nonconformists is a matter which looms large before the eyes of all clergymen

¹ This was a form of *conditional* allotment of seats.

in the western counties. The Bishop always handled it with large-heartedness and sagacity. In answer to his Chaplain, who was soon face to face with the question in the parish to which the Bishop had appointed him, he lays down general principles in some such terms as these, not without thought of their suitability to the individual case with which he was dealing :—

You will want strength and tact in dealing with the Nonconformists; some clergymen think it best to have nothing to do with them at all. It is not the best or highest policy, but sometimes it is the safest, and some men it suits.

How accurate was the prognosis of the difficulties in this connexion was verified not long afterwards in North Devon. A meeting was summoned in one of the larger towns, to promote Home Reunion. Owing to unintentional causes the Nonconformists of the district were irritated, and the Bishop, who had promised to preside at a gathering favourable to an object with which he sympathised, found himself in the presence of a crowded audience, consisting largely of opponents. The whole incident was an opportunity for the exercise of that patience and courage which he had more than one special occasion for displaying during his lifetime. In the midst of clamour and contention his attitude was self-restraint, dignity, and persistence.

“I am quite sure that all alike, in various ways, regret that the great Christian body should now present so very different an appearance from that which our Lord desired it to present when He prayed that we all may be one—one so that man should see it, and that the unity might be an evidence of the Divine mission which He Himself brought from His Father, and which He gave to His Apostles and Disciples to continue until He came again. I am quite sure that all alike will feel that, if there be any means which can bring

Christians closer to one another, it is the duty of all to study those means. We know very well that it is impossible for us, any one of us, either on one side or the other, to surrender what we believe to be God's truth. Even if we are mistaken, yet we cannot help it; our consciences bind us, and until it has pleased God to make us see more clearly, we are compelled to follow the guidance of those consciences. But, at any rate, it may be possible to remove those causes of differences which come from misunderstanding, which come from not really knowing each what the other thinks, which come from supposing things to be of greater importance than they are, which come, perhaps, a great deal from mere ignorance, and because we have not looked at both sides of the question. And I for my part am ready always to acknowledge that, however deep my own convictions may be, however much they have laid hold of me, however difficult I may find it ever to part with them, yet I should be foolish indeed if I did not confess that after all, in many particulars, I may be grievously mistaken, and that others may be right who seem to me to be wrong. It is in that spirit we ought to approach one another, earnestly desiring to recognise the common faith which we all hold, and the common Master whom we all worship. I do not know whether much can come out of any discussion or consideration of our differences. But it seems to me at any rate something is gained by the mere desire to come together. Something is gained if only we show in every possible way how we long for unity, though it may be as yet far off. It is out of the desire for unity; it is out of the desire to insist perpetually on those points on which we are agreed, and to remind one another how very much more we are agreed than we disagree; it is out of that that it seems to me that there is some hope that greater union may some day come, because if there be love to begin with and the spirit of love, there is hardly any miracle which we cannot hope will be brought by that which is above all other things."

The Bishop afterwards invited opponents to come upon the platform and take part in the discussion—an opportunity of which they availed themselves; but in spite of much demand he refused to put to the meeting any resolution on the merits of the actual question, and stated that, had he been informed that there was any intention of passing such a resolution, he would have declined to take the chair—the meeting was for discussion, and discussion only.

The refusal to put the resolution caused no little uproar, which was disregarded. The close of the meeting is an object-lesson as to the character of the Chairman, and shows the one point on which all were agreed.

The Bishop then thanked them for what they had said about his impartiality and courtesy, and in return he thanked those who sat on his left side for their courtesy towards him. It was not a matter of any surprise to him, because he had always found that his Nonconformist brethren had received him with the most entire kindness. (A voice: "We always shall.") "Thank you," the Bishop replied. "I feel it from my heart, and I desire particularly to acknowledge the kindness and the graciousness with which the resolution which was proposed has now been withdrawn. I feel that it is in itself a kindly expression of regard for me and a real act of union between both sides of the platform. I will now conclude with prayer." His lordship stood up holding his prayer-book in front of him. Cries of "Resolution" were still heard from the bottom of the hall, but the Bishop stood firm with book in hand, and, after a little while, there was silence, and he offered up prayer. The meeting separated quietly at eleven o'clock.¹

The Bishop draws his own conclusions on the whole incident in the following letter:—

THE PALACE, EXETER, *May 7, 1880.*

MY DEAR MR. GRANVILLE—I do not think the meeting on Friday did us any harm. But I very strongly advise your keeping out of all controversy with your Nonconformist friends for a long time.

I do not think there were any "roughs" at the meeting.
—Yours truly, F. EXON.

It is satisfactory to read the Rector's own judgment as to the eventual results:—

March 9, 1903.

I never regret that meeting myself. I am sure it did good, though it was very painful at the time and nearly killed me. Two men took Holy Orders afterwards who were then Wesleyans, and told me the discussion had

¹ *Exeter and Plymouth Gazette*, May 1880.

influenced them, and even the son of the chief opponent ultimately did the same.¹ And I believe a great many Nonconformists became Churchmen, more or less influenced by the discussion. Mr. —, . . . in the town, though he died a Dissenter, . . . often had talks with me afterwards on the subject, and I lent him Home Reunion literature.

Here are some illustrations of the modes in which principles were applied to practical questions generally :—

CONSECRATION OF CEMETERIES

FULHAM PALACE,
October 25, 1887.

MR DEAR SIR—I do not remember the Charge that I gave in 1882 sufficiently well to check the report of it. I can only say that I can conceive I may have said that the co-existence of the two chapels in a cemetery was a scandal and reproach. I thought so then and I think so still. But I certainly never said that I desired to give up the consecration of cemeteries or of any part of them. I should at all times have tried hard to have a consecrated ground for the burial of our people.

Some bishops, as I suppose you are aware, decline to consecrate cemeteries because the consecration does not reserve the ground for the use of the Church. But I cannot agree. I have always consecrated, and have refused to license.

. . . I steadily refused from the first to the last when I was Bishop of Exeter to allow parishes to be left without any consecrated ground. But I was always willing to consecrate a whole cemetery, and obliterate the distinction between consecrated and unconsecrated in *that* way.—Yours truly,

F. LONDON.

INSCRIPTION ON MEMORIAL TABLET

Inscription.—She was a member of the Bible Christian denomination for fifty-nine years, and a local preacher for fifty years in the said (section) or denomination.

June 8, 1878.

I think I should use my eloquence with the preacher to try to persuade him to yield, as all the rest of the parish do.

¹ He is now an incumbent in the Diocese of Exeter.

But if he will not, I should not object to the word "Bible." Coupled with denomination it is, I think, harmless.

I should try to get him to omit the last half sentence, and to substitute for it the words "and teacher" after "member."

I myself should rather yield than go to law. But there is no doubt that you can insist on his getting a Faculty before he puts it up.

Once put up (even by stealth and by night) you cannot remove it without a Faculty.

JOINT EXAMINATION OF BOARD SCHOOLS IN RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE

THE PALACE, EXETER,
June 26, 1862.

. . . I cannot agree with the Archdeacon of Exeter (Sanders) in thinking that Mr. Barnes will do wrong in taking a part with a Nonconformist in the examination of a Board School in religious knowledge. Let us in every way encourage partial religious instruction when we cannot get complete. And since the instruction is to be undenominational it is not unreasonable that there should be various examiners to see that no denominational questions are set. Depend upon it, *all* study of the Bible ultimately tends to the advantage of the Church.

REV. R. GRANVILLE.

ADMISSION OF A MEMBER OF THE CHURCH OF ROME INTO THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

THE PALACE, EXETER,
December 16, 1870.

MY DEAR —,—I think it would probably be better that the lady about whom you write should be formally received. Such a step should be deliberate and public in order to guard against its being taken lightly. It is not necessary that she should be received in her own parish church. She may choose for herself.

Nothing more is needed than a quiet but public announcement immediately before the Exhortation (not the Notice) in the Communion Office to the effect that —,—, hitherto a member of the Church of Rome, desires to be admitted into the Church of England, and that the Bishop has directed that she be allowed to receive the Holy Communion accord-

ingly. Then let her communicate at that celebration with the rest.

I think it more straightforward, and in every way better, that she should tell the priest what she is going to do.

No less practical is the advice given on different points as to the services of the Church. In reply to a request for advice as to the expediency of maintaining the daily service in a country parish, he answers by stating the law on the subject, and concludes, "If I were in your place, I should find daily service the greatest help, and should certainly keep it up."

The following letter is in some sense supplemental to the above advice:—

TIME FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC BAPTISM

EXETER, *June 1, 1875.*

MY DEAR —,—The Rubric which orders the Baptism to follow the second lesson must be read with that which orders Daily Service. If you have Daily Service, you ought to have the Baptism after the second lesson. But I do not think a clergyman can rightly hold to the Baptismal Rubric which his people do not like, and give up the other Rubric which he does not like.

Whether you have the Baptism on Sunday or week-day is a question not of law but of expediency. In these days I certainly should not press for a Sunday if I were a clergyman.

If *they* press to have the Baptism on a Sunday I should be firm to have it in service time in such a parish as —.

I think I have covered all your points.

He advises that children of ten years of age should be baptized as adults.

THE PALACE, EXETER,
December 14, 1878.

MY DEAR SIR—I do not think children of ten ought to be baptized as infants, however stupid or ignorant. They should be carefully prepared for Baptism. When you think any one of them ready for Baptism, you have my sanction for administering that Sacrament.

It should not be administered on the same day as Con-

firmation. But there need not be a long interval.—Yours truly,
F. EXON.

His reverence for the Sacraments of the Church, coupled with his respect for law and individual rights, is conspicuous in the following letters :—

THE PALACE, EXETER,
December 17, 1878.

I think you will do wisely to see —— and press upon him that he ought not to come to the Holy Communion while he is under this cloud of suspicion. He must have been guilty of levity to make it possible to suspect him so gravely.

But beyond advice you cannot go.

You cannot refuse a man on suspicion. All you can do is to press upon him the fearful responsibility he incurs.

THE PALACE, EXETER,
December 30, 1879.

Your question about the marriage of unbaptized persons raised a point of law which I did not like to settle without consideration and consultation.

I am advised by high legal authority (and I fear there is no doubt that it is true) that we cannot refuse the marriage service to unbaptized people. There is a special provision for Jews and Quakers. But all others we must marry.

This is what the law is; I cannot say I think that it is what the law ought to be.

Characteristic of his clearness of view in regard to spiritual matters is his judgment in regard to an irregular marriage :—

5 VICTORIA TERRACE, WORTHING,
August 27, 1884.

I do not like the idea of using our marriage service for a purpose for which it was never intended, namely, consecrating a marriage already consummated years ago. The —— are married people. Their marriage was, in the eye of the Church (and in the judgment of God), irregular. But it was valid nevertheless. *Fieri non debuit; factum valet.* To use the marriage service now is to lower the service. People who have done wrong have no right to ask us to lower the service in order to set their feelings at rest. It is part of their punishment to bear the pain of thinking that their marriage was in the beginning unblest.

The case is parallel to that of baptism by heretics or schismatics. Such baptism (unless administered by those who denied the Trinity, and consequently *could* not rightly use the proper words) has been always held valid, but yet irregular. Such baptism cannot be repeated; but it ought to be repented of.

It would be quite right that the — should use whatever form of repentance most satisfied their own consciences; for instance, they might observe the anniversary of their wedding-day every year with fasting and penitent prayer. But they ought not, in my judgment, to ask or to have the Marriage Service.

F. EXON.

I presume there are no children.

His habitual view that merciful treatment is the most just comes out in the following letter as to the burial of infidels:—

THE PALACE, EXETER,
March 15, 1881.

You are right in refusing to use the Burial Service at the interment of an avowed infidel.

But possibly you may find that he may become softened at the approach of death. It is something that he allows your visits. You ought to be very sure that he does not repent, if you are to refuse him Christian burial.

You are of course aware that he may, or his friends after his death may, procure some one else to bury him with any service whatever. In that case you have nothing to do with the matter.—Yours faithfully,

F. EXON.

Let me know in a day or two if he is still alive, and whether he shows any sign of change in his opinions.

The spirit in which he received, recognised, and encouraged meritorious service is thus illustrated:—

PLYMOUTH, April 27, 1870.

MY DEAR MR. BARNES¹—Do you think that you can undertake a mission into Cornwall? I want a man to go down to — and take charge of it during the vacancy of the living. It is in a very bad condition, and requires a *vigorous* man for a little while.

¹ Subsequently Archdeacon of Barnstaple and Treasurer of Exeter Cathedral.

You will, of course, have to provide for your own place in your absence. But possibly that would not be very difficult.—Yours truly,
F. EXON.

July 8, 1870.

MY DEAR BARNES—As —— has now been instituted, your mission at —— is at an end, and you can go back to your own living.

You have done at —— precisely what I wanted you to do, and I doubt if any one could have done it better.

I shall look out for an opportunity to give you more important work than the charge of your present living.—
Yours very truly,
F. EXON.

The preceding letters serve to show how official relations gradually shaded off into personal. Friendships with him could become very close and intimate, and the power of his influence over those who were fully drawn to him was unique. His words were not many, but the crisp, terse phrase of his utterances had a special power of its own. It is thus that he writes to an old pupil when asking him to come into Devonshire as his chaplain :—

RUGBY, October 14, 1869.

MY DEAR SANDFORD—The first letter that I wrote when I was allowed to mention the fact of my nomination for Exeter was to the Archbishop of Canterbury to ask his leave to ask you to come to me instead of to him.

He asked you as a favour to you, but now that I have leave to do so I ask you as a favour to me.

Will you think of it?—Yours affectionately,
F. TEMPLE.

My letter to him had to wander and I have only just got his answer.

The reply and the letter that followed it speak for themselves :—

*ALVECHURCH, REDDITCH,
October 15, 1869.*

MY DEAR DR. TEMPLE—I accept your most kind offer most gratefully and gladly. I could have few greater pleasures or

privileges than to work under you, and try, if it is in my power, to help you, and make others know you and love you. . . .

Whatever you wish me to do, I will do as well as I can; only, might I ask you at your convenience to let me know what you want from me, and when you want me? . . . With my renewed thanks, and my love to Miss Temple,—Yours with gratitude and affection,
E. G. SANDFORD.

RUGBY, *October 16, 1869.*

DEAR SANDFORD—Your letter has made me very glad. . . .

I am very sorry to hear of your sick household. I hope the illness will soon pass away. Give my love to the Archdeacon.—Yours most affectionately,
F. TEMPLE.

The friendship begun at Rugby grew stronger to the very end, and even when official ties were broken, the sometime pupil and chaplain found Dr. Temple's home his own. There was much work to do where the Bishop lived, but never once, though the chaplain might break in upon the busiest moments, was there a petulant or impatient word, or any mention, if he had done his best, of blunder or inefficiency, and all was not business, as these words show :—

EXETER, *December 31, 1872.*

MY DEAR SANDFORD—This is not on business, but only to wish you a Happy New Year, . . . and you know that I wish it to the Archdeacon with all the honour and regard that his long life in God's service deserves from all of us that know him. . . .

I hope you are getting better and stronger, and enjoying much happiness.—Yours affectionately,
F. EXON.

The allusion to “getting better” is explained in the following letter written a few days later :—

EXETER, *January 22, 1873.*

I am very sorry indeed to have such an account of your health. Of course we must all submit, and if the Exeter climate is not good for you at present you must stay away from it. The loss of your companionship is a good deal more to me just now than even the loss of your work, though

the latter is not a little. Nevertheless, we must bear what God sends.

I cannot at present say anything about the future. I must turn it over in my mind, and will write to you again in a few days. . . .

Not many busy men would be content, even for affection's sake, to continue for a year such an arrangement as the next letter proposes :—

EXETER, *January 24, 1873.*

I cannot undertake just at present to drill a new chaplain. It would simply be a greater burden than help.

I want you, therefore, to keep your present post for a time at any rate. I will send you the letters to be answered with minutes of the answers in the corners. The difference will be that you will answer them from Alvechurch instead of from the library here. The delay is not of real consequence, and you will of course try to prevent it from being greater than it must.

The going about on Confirmation tours is not now of so much need as it was. You have pretty well drilled the clergy in my ways.

Kate will do the sending out of circulars. She can now do that very well.

I will try this plan at any rate for the present. If you get work that you like, it may be advisable to make a change.

* The above is an instance of *exceeding* consideration for others. A touch of the same quality is illustrated by the following memorandum with the closing incident :—

In 1877 (was it?) he spent several weeks at He had offered to take my whole duty, but *not part* of it. I could not be away that month, having been away for a usual month already, and having certain parish tribulations to tackle. . . . He was always in church when there was a service, Sunday and week-day, and we exchanged calls and saw something of his ladies, but nothing of him. At the end of his stay he sent me word that he wished to preach on the Sunday afternoon. It was a grand sermon *for us*, on the second commandment, and would have been great anywhere—making graven images—not literally, but making

our own ideas of God—low ideas leading to tolerance of evil in ourselves, etc. etc. The next morning, before he left for Exeter, he came to the vicarage, “I just came to tell you not to be cast down.”

Another and by no means unfrequent form of consideration comes out in the appended narrative received from a former Rural Dean in the Exeter Diocese :—

An old clergyman, curate in sole charge of a very poor living, and receiving only a small stipend, and with hardly any private means, drifted into debt, although he and his wife lived very quietly. He was not a good man of business, and illness probably accounted for part of the debt, which in the course of two or three years amounted to £80 or £90. Some of the clergy in the Deanery, knowing the old man and his blameless life, privately collected amongst themselves a sum of money to lessen his debts, and the Rural Dean took on himself to write to the Bishop and tell him what was being done. No answer came, and the writer regretted he had written, as very possibly the Bishop was inundated with appeals for charities and societies of all kinds—indeed, seeing the Bishop at a railway station, he avoided meeting him. But soon the old curate called, and asked the Rural Dean if he had written to the Bishop. He was told “Yes.” The old man said that that accounted for what had puzzled him, for he had received a letter from the Bishop appointing a day and hour at which he was to see him at Exeter, and he went. “Well, what happened?” he was asked; the answer was, “The Bishop said, ‘What will clear you of your debts?’ I said, ‘£50.’ The Bishop at once wrote and gave me a cheque for £50, and said, ‘Good-day.’”

But there was another side; he could be “short,” even with those whom he liked and respected. He was especially susceptible to signs of unprepared and disordered work, and had a special objection to requests for the reopening of points which he had already settled. He was rather a strong tonic at times to loss of nerve.

On that occasion (writes an official who had been come down upon) I had, as Secretary, arranged matters, but had no

one I could persuade to speak first after the Bishop, and the Bishop had refused to say what he would speak about. His address had taken the wind out of my sails, and I fumbled about, left out part because he had said it, and part because he had said the opposite of it, and made a general mess. Going with him to the station I received a scolding for not having my firstly, secondly, and thirdly, and generally for not having my ideas sufficiently in order.

In the following extract from a letter he speaks the truth in love to a very close friend :—

I had begun to fear that you were letting “nerves” get the better of you—I wonder whether you thought my letters *very* ferocious. I rather hope you did.—Yours very affectionately,
F. EXON.

There was no sting in such admonitions. They were “precious balms” that broke no man’s head. But with cases of gross neglect of duty he could be very stern; with proved guilt, which persisted in screening itself by falsehood, he would make no terms. A gradual depression of the standard of life and character in a clergyman was especially painful to him. But for all that he always judged men at their best, and if the verdict was at fault, for the most part it erred on the side of over leniency. His heart towards the individual man was tender; towards his best friends the love was “wonderful.” The quotation of letters may well be closed with those which show how to each he could give just “the food convenient,” kindling the young, and imparting a glow of pride in the sense of his friendship,—following the old to the very end with affection and appreciation of tried work and character.

PLYMOUTH, *July 5, 1874.*

MY DEAR SANDFORD—I have thought much of you to-day and of your entrance on your new duties. And for the sake of old affection, now going for nearly sixteen years, I have had you much in my prayers.

God bless you in your new work, and give you not only

success, and, if it please Him, visible success, but peace also and quiet happiness. The work of a country parish to those whose work never penetrates below the surface not only seems, but in course of time is sure to become very monotonous. Not so to those who put their hearts into the spiritual welfare of their people. And you, I trust, will find in it an ever-increasing blessing.

Remember me in your prayers, as I, you may be assured, never forget you in mine. We shall often come across each other, and always shall we find a pleasure in meeting. For we can trust each other's hearts. God be with you.—Your affectionate,
F. EXON.

OLD PALACE, CANTERBURY,
December 9, 1899.

MY DEAR ROGERS—It is good to see a very old friend's handwriting, and it is specially good when the handwriting tells about another friend, not known so long but highly valued. Chappell, I suppose, is now quite laid on the shelf, but what good work he has done in the course of his life and how quietly he can contemplate the future.

You, my dear friend, are resting in some degree, and your delightful children a perpetual joy, and your wife more than ever a part of yourself and fading away into the blessed future for both of you. God is wonderfully good to us.

I am well still, though some of the infirmities of old age are already upon me. I do not find my power of work diminished as yet, but I have poor sight, I can no longer walk as in former days, and my hearing is beginning to go. I can still think and still enjoy study. God is good to me also, and has given me a wonderful wife and two perfect boys.

God's mercy be on us all.—Your affectionate old school-fellow,
F. CANTUAR.

OLD PALACE, CANTERBURY,
November 18, 1899.

MY DEAR WHIGHAM—Thank you much for writing to tell me about Leopold Acland's funeral. He was one of my oldest friends. I knew him first when I went to stay with Canon Lawson, then his curate, in 1847. And I learnt to value him very much. How unworldly he was; how simple; how affectionate; how careful and diligent in his parish. To have known him was and is a perpetual blessing.

God make us worthy to have had such examples.—Yours affectionately,
F. CANTUAR.

Dr. Temple was a born educator, and could not help exercising influence on others. The clergy specially were brought under the spell; a new inspiration, a higher conception of their office came into the whole body. It was not given to all men to receive him; he required to be known. All were not capable of knowing him, and some had not the opportunity; but to those who received him, he came almost as a new revelation of what a man could be; and some who had most sympathy with such a nature were drawn by a magnetic influence stronger than any other which they had ever known.

CHAPTER VIII

THE BISHOP AND THE PEOPLE

(Social Life)

Presentation of pastoral staff—Private friendships—West of England Bank—Franco-German War—Soldiers and sailors—Temperance—Purity—Deceased Wife's Sister Bill—Good manners—Self-culture.

ON S. Luke's Day, October 18, 1877, a great service was held in Exeter Cathedral to celebrate the completion of its restoration. On the evening of that day, in the hall of the Palace, the Bishop was presented with a pastoral staff by leading laymen of his diocese. On the address accompanying the staff was the following inscription :—

Presented to Frederick Temple, Lord Bishop of Exeter, for the use of himself and his successors in the See, in testimony of the high respect and admiration entertained by the subscribers for the zeal and energy displayed by him in the administration of his diocese, and for his liberality in surrendering a portion of his income and patronage for the endowment of the See of Truro.¹

The leading note of the Bishop's reply was Episcopacy as a centre of unity and united work. "More than ever before," he said, "age after age seems to accumulate within itself all the excellence

¹ A corresponding recognition from the clergy of the diocese was the Bishop's portrait painted by Mr. Prynne, son of the well-known Plymouth incumbent, which now hangs in the Palace at Exeter. It was not actually executed until Dr. Temple had been translated to London, the subscriptions having been temporarily lost at the time of the failure of the West of England Bank.

and good of all the ages that preceded it"; and of this historic unity Episcopacy is a symbol and expression.

The presentation of the staff is thus a suitable starting-point for a chapter entitled "The Bishop and the People," and it expresses the character of his Episcopate in this connexion. Its aim was unity, not in any narrower or more formal sense, but the comprehensive unity which draws not only all systems, but all life, into one. This unity Bishop Temple was fitted to promote by his own personality, and all his work made for it; it became evident to all men that he presided over a branch of the Church of the Incarnation—a Church in sympathy with all humanity.

Thus he was a Bishop, not of the clergy only, but of the laity. In recalling his administration we are reminded of Dean Church's words :

A bishop was there to remind Christians of that vast, wide, spiritual society which was meant to embrace us all; of the force and value of what is common, and public, and continuous, and customary. He was there to bind together in each age the old and the new, the weak and the strong; to witness, amid the vicissitudes of individual thought and energy, for something which, with less show, wears better and lasts longer; for a common inheritance of faith and religion, which needs indeed to be filled up in its outlines by private conviction and activity, but without which everything private risks becoming one-sided in ideas and cramped in sympathy, and, at last, poor in heart.¹

The donors of the staff were leading laymen. It has often been said that Bishop Temple was never quite at home in the House of Lords, and never caught its tone when speaking there; but he impressed the Peers with his nobility of character, and their last recollection of him will be the scene in which, with pathetic dignity, he embodied that

¹ *Pascal and other Sermons*, by Dean Church, pp. 111-112.

courage to the death which is one of their noblest characteristics. Nor will one who heard his words forget the vehemence with which, even in the early days of his demonstrative Liberalism, he defended the hereditary principle against the attacks of a young republican. Some of his chief friends were to be found amongst the leading laity of his diocese—William, Earl of Devon, Sir Stafford Northcote (afterwards the first Lord Iddesleigh), Sir John Duke Coleridge (afterwards Lord Coleridge), Colonel (now Sir Robert) White Thomson, and the late Earl Fortescue. One of the most touching sights which met the eye on the platform of Victoria Station, when the body of the Archbishop was borne away from London to Canterbury, was the form of the last mentioned of these friends, paying by his presence in extreme old age a final tribute of admiration and affection. In his case, as in that of Sir Thomas Acland, whom Dr. Temple first met at Notting Hill on January 14, 1857,¹ the earliest bond of sympathy was interest in the cause of education, especially as it affected the middle class. But it did not end there. The intimacy ripened into the closest friendship: the men loved, because they understood each other. The friendship with Sir Stafford Northcote and Sir John Coleridge began at the University. Colonel White Thomson was drawn to him in later life by personal sympathy, affection, and the tie of common interests. In Church matters Bishop Temple did not see eye to eye with Lord Devon, but the friendship which grew up between them was another striking instance of the cementing power of common work and character.

But the attraction in these cases was to individuals and not to a class. Dr. Temple was not a courtier,² and except in cases where there was

¹ Editor's Supplement, vol. ii. p. 540.

² *Ibid.* p. 582.

some common ground of intellectual sympathy or human interests, he and society were not quite at ease with one another. The chief point of contact between the Bishop and this class as a whole was his endeavour, by encouraging simplicity of life and promoting unselfish effort for the common good, to bring it into closer fellowship with the mass of the people.

The sympathy deepened the nearer he came to those who were identified with the common work and interests of daily life. Thirty years before he had dreamed a young man's dream about the chivalry of industry. Writing to his friend Robert Lawson in 1846 he had said :—

There was much in chivalry that partook of the spirit of lifeless formality ; but the idea, as most of the ideas of the Middle Ages, was noble and beautiful and Christian. The profession of arms has now passed away ; the industrial, not the military, life is to be the greatest business of the world. As the military sprang from the foulest sources, from robbery and violence and animal passion, so, too, the industrial has a low and degraded origin—mere love of money and selfish gain. But the one before its death was gradually purified into a lofty and noble calling in spite of its natural opposition to all that is lofty and noble ; and if we have had a chivalry of arms, why not a chivalry of industry ? I believe it is coming, though centuries must elapse before it can reach that state. And when it does come it will be infinitely nobler than the other chivalry, for it contains in it none of those really low debasing elements. A regular order like the old knights, of course, I am not dreaming of, though such a spirit, if realised, will soon issue in congenial institutions. But they will come of themselves, only let us, if we can, help the growth of the temper which is to be so developed. Such seems to me the course of history, and, therefore, I cannot think that man ought to look upon secular employments as anything else than a service of God ; the world we know will go on as God has ordained, whatever the men who carry it on may be ; but the privilege of the Christian is that he works with his eyes open, and his labour perishes not ; the worldling is but a mere instrument, which,

when it has been used for its purpose, will be cast away as worthless. I cannot think when we find a world working rapidly onwards, when we see all around us full of life and energy, when we are taught that all this is God's ordinance, that it can be our duty to hold back; I think an instinct, a right instinct, will drive England into a redoubled activity of labour, and because I think it a right instinct I fear much for any Church which refuses to acknowledge it. And so I long to see again the days of the Middle Ages, when the Church was at the head of all that was doing, and science and literature and every kind of enterprise was headed by men who laboured in her name. . . .

I do not know what all this may seem like to one who takes a different view of things—perhaps ranting nonsense. But it is not so to me; with all that I feel to make me hesitate, and finding few quite to agree in it, I cannot give it up. It may be nonsense as I have stated it, but I am sure what I *mean* is no nonsense, and I really wish you would think of it too.

The experience of life had toughened the fibre of thought, but it had not quenched the ideal; it had only given the inspiration practical force. Bishop Temple at Exeter, as afterwards in London and at Canterbury, was the friend of municipal life, throwing himself specially into all such projects as aimed at the improvement of social conditions and the brightening and elevation of the life of the people—co-operative societies, charity organisation, improved dwellings. In all such matters city men were profoundly impressed by his practical capacity and knowledge of affairs. His schemes were such as would work. They recognised that he knew as much about business as they knew themselves. "Bishop Temple," said a leading citizen, years afterwards, "when amongst us, was a member of a recognised triumvirate—the Diocesan, the Mayor, and the Lord Lieutenant—and their pronouncements had something of the force of statutory edicts."¹

¹ Alluded to by Archbishop Temple in his speech in the Guildhall, Exeter, in 1897.

The year 1878 closed gloomily in Devonshire owing to the failure of the West of England Bank. The liabilities were estimated at three and a half millions; the shareholders numbered about 2000, and were drawn largely from the lower middle class, comprising a great number of widows of tradesmen and professional men. Their liabilities were unlimited and the distress was widespread. The distress, being unavoidable, was just of the kind which appealed most strongly to the Bishop. He promptly put himself at the head of the movement for relief.

How thoroughly he took his own personal share is plain from what he said at a meeting held at Plymouth on June 9, 1879 :—

He was quite sure, having himself taken part in every investigation that had yet been made, that, if any committee of impartial men were to review their work and to have put clearly before them the reasons why they had made such grants of assistance as they had, they would be perfectly satisfied that the grants had been given for the relief of distress and nothing else.

His special sympathy with the interests of the aged comes out in his final words :—

The provision eventually to be made for the permanent assistance of these poor people, such as to relieve them from very exceeding distress, would require a very large sum of money. He believed that they had found, if they were to take only the old people above sixty, and to purchase for them annuities for the rest of their lives, equal to what they had lost, it would require something little short of £20,000. Of course they could not profess to do anything like that; they could only do their best to enable these poor people to live for the rest of their lives without positively going to the work-house.

Bishop Temple's conduct in regard to the bank

failure sank deeply into the mind of the commercial community, and left upon it a more lasting impression than anything else which he did in the course of his Episcopate, owing to its combination of tenderness, business capacity, and willingness to take infinite pains. The best lessons filter down slowly, and such characters as Bishop Temple's are not quickly read. Not until he was Archbishop was the appreciation by Exonians so complete as to lead them to make Frederick Temple a Freeman of the city; but memory then awoke. Later on, when the life of labour was at last closed, thoughts were gathered up in a few significant words of his friend, the Registrar of the Diocese (the late Mr. Arthur Burch), at a meeting held in the castle to inaugurate a memorial. The life was of such a kind that the memory of it will deepen as time goes by.

Early in the Exeter Episcopate he had the opportunity of showing his sympathy with suffering in a wider area. Within a few months of his coming the Franco-German war broke out (1870). Dr. Temple withdrew from party politics after he became Bishop; but the larger interests of politics suited his cast of mind and habit of thought, specially engrossing him when they touched national movements and the griefs and aspirations of men. There are some who can still recall the solemnity and sense of awe with which he spoke at the Guildhall meeting at Exeter in aid of the sick and wounded, September 3, 1870—the day on which the news of the battle of Sedan and the collapse of the second French Empire was received.

Mingling with sympathy with suffering and the calamities of a great nation, it was easy to see the special interest manifested in soldiers. Frederick Temple never forgot that he was a soldier's son. Many were struck with the plain tokens of fellow-

feeling with the soldier in one of his first sermons in Rugby Chapel ;¹ and he gave proof of it afterwards on more than one public occasion, notably in 1871, when preaching to the Militia in the nave of Exeter Cathedral. When addressing soldiers for the last time, shortly before his death, he declared that he never could hear the sound of troops in march without a thrill, and without wishing to march with them.

The calling of seamen struck the same chord of human sympathy in his nature. A terrible storm, which raged round the southern coast in February 1877, and made many children fatherless, excited his compassion and gave him his opportunity, and from that time onwards he took the Brixham Orphanage under his special charge. He fitted it into the routine of other Episcopal duties, being constant in attendance at committees, speaking on its behalf in and out of season, and selecting chief men amongst his clergy to watch over its interests. And there is something deeper than the tone of official interest in the words of his address to the friends of Missions for Seamen at their annual meeting at Exeter in April 1875. He did not think that the country had a sufficient sense of its debt to sailors. The Society was excellent, but not adequate. For his own part "he confessed that he desired that this work should be taken up by the Church as a whole. He wished that the Society, instead of being as now a rather small Society, consisting only of persons who had some direct connexion with the work, should be much larger—that, in fact, it should be taken up by the leaders of the Church, and organised as the proper instrument of doing what he considered to be a part of the work of the whole Church." He had the same wish in regard to soldiers, and his desire

¹ *Sermons*, vol. i., "Love and Duty."

was not forgotten; it explains his action as Primate, nearly twenty years later.¹

The Bishop's instinctive sympathy with common humanity resulted not merely in interest in special callings or efforts to meet special cases, but in a search for the true principles upon which to deal with the collective problem. He found them in a few simple ground truths which specially touched himself. Of these the chief was self-help, as will be seen from a speech which he made at the Brighton Church Congress the year before his death.

There is one general conclusion at which I arrived some time back, and that is, that I am convinced that if you are to remedy the trouble and distress of those who, for various reasons, are now, as it were, in the very lowest stage of society, you must carry them with you, or you can do nothing. There is a tendency in that class to apathy, to a false contentment . . . with bad surroundings, which drags them down in spite of every effort you may make to draw them up. And what they like is, as a general rule, steadily to resist all that is best to be done for them; and I think that the philanthropists should bear this in mind in all their dealings with the poor. . . . But there is a terrible temptation to a philanthropist to formulate a good scheme, and then to think much more of the scheme than the individuals who are to be benefited by the working of it.

Self-help and self-control had been engrained in Dr. Temple from earliest years; in him they were combined with self-sacrifice. These three principles were the secret of his staunch advocacy of the cause of temperance. Few people quite understood the dominant place which that cause held in his mind, forcing from him such expressions as these—"He was so impressed with the importance of the movement that he felt at times as though he could wish to divest himself of other duties, and devote himself entirely to it"; but there were few who fully gauged the depth either of his

¹ Editor's Supplement, vol. ii. p. 675.

sympathy with the 'common people,' or of his belief in these three principles as the 'means of their salvation.'

With total abstinence he had natural affinities from the first, as some amusing references to his school days imply. When a small boy at Blundell's he was asked out to dinner by a gentleman in the neighbourhood who had known his father, and writing about it afterwards to his mother, he says: "The boys laughed at me very much when I told them that I had not drunk any wine, but only a tumbler of water."¹ In a letter to his little brother, "Johnnie," written about the same time, he says: "I can tell you I'm better off here than you are, for I have a hot penny roll with butter every morning, with some hot milk, and as much bread and butter at supper as I can eat, with some good beer, though, to tell the truth, I like water better"; he adds, "but then you have Mamma and Netta, and that makes up for all the penny rolls and bread and butter in the world."

There was thus what out-and-out teetotallers might call "latent grace" from the first. The history of the actual conversion is given in the following memorandum:²—

The attention of Dr. Temple was called to the temperance question by the Rugby Temperance Society soon after he became Headmaster, and in 1862 he accepted the invitation of the National Temperance League to preside at a meeting in the Town Hall. . . . Dr. Temple proved to be antagonistic. . . . What took place, however, was enough to make the friends of temperance feel that it was worth while to make further efforts to enlist the Headmaster on their side, and subsequent events justified the attempt; for when, six or seven years later, Mr. Waite, the secretary, arranged a meeting on the platform between Dr. Temple (in the chair),

¹ Letter from F. Temple to his mother, February 26, 1834.

² Memorandum from Mr. Morris Davies, Hon. Secretary of the Old Rugbeian Society.

and Mr. Thomas Wyles, Principal of Allesley Park College, near Coventry, the opposition of the Chairman was distinctly weaker.

The next year the Doctor readily consented to take the chair again. . . . At the close of the meeting Mr. Waite, in moving a vote of thanks to the Chairman, narrated a story of a boy whose teacher could not induce him to say A in learning the alphabet, and after pressure gave as a reason that if he did he would be asked to say B. Dr. Temple enjoyed the hit immensely, laughed heartily, and in his reply said, "You have got me to say A and B, and I suppose you will not be content till I have said the whole of the alphabet."

The next step in the recital of the alphabet was the acceptance of the chair at the anniversary of the United Kingdom Alliance in the Free Trade Hall, Manchester, in 1869. He was then Bishop-elect of Exeter. In 1878 a testimonial was subscribed for in recognition of the service of Mr. Waite to the temperance cause, and Dr. Temple readily acceded to the request of the committee to go down to Rugby to present it at a public meeting.

But though the principle of total abstinence may have been accepted at Rugby, the practice was not entirely adopted until later years, nor were the doctrines of the extreme school ever part of Dr. Temple's creed. What grew was steady devotion to the temperance cause, and it received new impulse as soon as he became Bishop and was brought into fuller relations with national life. It forms one of the subjects of his primary charge in 1872 :—

And now I pass on from the work the clergy do in their schools, to the work they do in their parishes, and I wish, in the first place, to ask you how imperative a duty it is with any Church entrusted, as ours is, with the care of a whole country, not to see a great sin doing most terrible mischief to thousands and thousands of our people without the most persevering and conscientious efforts to study what are the causes of it, and what the remedies. . . . It is not our business to legislate for the country at large, and if we are to take any part in legislation, we take it, not as clergy, nor

as laity of the Church, but as subjects of the Queen. . . . But do not let us fancy that making our services reverent and orderly, and our churches beautiful and glorious, . . . and by preaching to the best of our power the doctrine of the Cross to those who will be there to hear us—do not let us fancy that this is any more our duty than the duty of wrestling with this terrible mischief which seems more and more to lay hold upon our people. It is the glory of the Church of England that the ministers of that Church do a great deal more than their visible and public work; that their private ministrations are very often of much higher value than anything which meets the public eye—and all this may be used, if only we will endeavour to use it quietly and steadily, to deal with this terrible evil. I speak very earnestly on this subject because I feel very deeply; there is hardly any service which the Church of England could render to this country greater than that of grappling with this terrible mischief.

These words may be regarded as the inauguration of the Bishop's temperance work in the diocese, and from utterances thus grave, but passionless, did the most prominent effort of his Episcopate flow. The principles had already taken root in his mind; convictions had been strengthened by a study of the lately published report of the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury on Intemperance (1869), with its abundant evidence of widespread evil; but the immediate occasion for speech may perhaps be found in the startling object-lesson given by the discreditable scene of the meeting of the United Kingdom Alliance held in Exeter (January 23, 1872), a few weeks before the delivery of this charge. Bishop Temple often had to meet during his lifetime the opposition of religious opponents; but it was left to supporters of the publican interest in his own Cathedral city to carry opposition to the length of physical violence. Whatever excuse there was for the exhibition must be found in the irritation and alarm caused to the liquor traffic by Mr. Bruce's Licensing Bill, which was

then before Parliament. In order to show what actually took place it may be well to give the realistic account of the local press:—

By seven o'clock the hall was almost filled, and it was said that a large number of persons gained admission by means of forged tickets. Besides this a number of men, who, it appeared, could not have been provided even with spurious tickets of entry, forced their way into the hall; the door-keepers did their utmost to keep them back, but it was of no avail, the mob quickly beating them out. From the first it was evident that the proceedings would be stormy, but one was hardly prepared for the exhibition of violence that occurred during the two hours that the meeting lasted. . . . The chair was taken by the Bishop, and on the platform also were Sir Wilfrid Lawson, M.P.; G. O. Trevelyan, Esq., M.P.; Sir John Bowring, and many others. As soon as the Bishop appeared he was greeted with cheers mingled with some hisses.

The Bishop said . . . the time had come when it appeared to him that the cause of temperance ought to gather round it all who were willing to support it, when they should welcome those who would only go a little way as well as those who would go a great way. . . . He believed it would be a very long time indeed before any one who supported the Alliance to the very utmost would have any reason to repent of having gone too far. (Cheers.) He believed that with all their enthusiasm, with their most earnest determination to carry their principles into effect, and not only that, but by their votes at elections—(Hear, hear, and cheers and voices, "No politics!")—it would be a long time before they would be able to obtain anything more than a bare minimum. . . . (A voice, "Drop politics," and cries of "Turn him out.") This was the signal for some confusion at the end of the room, but it could not be seen by the reporters, as almost the whole of the audience rose to their feet, and a great many mounted on to their chairs. When order had been a little restored, the Bishop said there was another thing he wanted to urge on all those who would listen to him. . . . He wanted them to do their very best to compel public opinion of their own class to put down the evil of intemperance amongst themselves (Cheers); he wanted to make drunkards feel that their own fellow-men who could judge of their temptation, and knew what it was that tempted them—(A

voice, "You want to rob a man of his beer")—who knew their weakness and their strength, condemned their conduct. (Confusion, and a voice, "Where's the police?" Fighting went on freely at the end of the hall for a few minutes.) . . .

A terrible row ensued. A cry was raised, amid shouts and yells at the bottom of the room, "To the platform," and a rush was accordingly made to the right side of the hall by a number of men to effect this object. Then a terrific battle followed. The teetotallers fought desperately to keep back their opponents, but were beaten back. . . . The scene was one of the most indescribable confusion, the whole of the audience being on their legs, some standing on chairs, others rushing to the side doors to make their escape, as the mob appeared likely to force their way to the front. . . .

Upon comparative quiet being restored, Mr. G. O. Trevelyan, M.P., came forward, and was greeted with mingled cheering and hooting. A man mounted a chair at the back of the room and shouted something about depriving the poor man of his rights, denying to him what the rich could get for themselves. Upon this Mr. Trevelyan invited him to the platform, and accordingly to the platform he came, escorted by a number of his associates. The man had apparently been in the heat of the former scrimmage, for his clothes were literally torn off his back, and there was little to cover the upper part of his body except the fragment of a shirt. One of the other men produced a black bottle, apparently, however, empty, and, wishing the audience luck, went through the pantomime of drinking, afterwards passing the bottle to his fellows, who went through a similar performance. This was the signal for roars of laughter, yells, and hisses.

Mr. Raper said he hoped that they would now have a good meeting. It was evident, however, that certain men had come there to create a disturbance.

One of the belligerents who was upon the platform hereupon indignantly wished to propose an amendment, and he mounted his chair for that purpose. He then made a rambling speech, concluding with the words, "I likes my beer, and I shall have it—there!" (Loud laughter.)

During the delivery of this oration, delivered with a number of flourishes of the black bottle before mentioned, several gentlemen on the platform endeavoured to stop the speaker's garrulity, but it was of no avail. The friends of

the three men on the platform, seeing that they were being remonstrated with, apparently deemed it their duty to go to their succour, and they made a rush to the platform, and another battle royal ensued, a number of their friends going on the platform, overturning the chairs, and putting the Chairman in imminent peril. Whilst this was going on Mr. Superintendent Steel, with five or six policemen, entered, and the three men who first went upon the platform and two others were removed in custody.

Mr. Trevelyan then continued his speech amidst constant interruptions. There must be something very bad in a cause, he said, which sent its poor victims to interrupt proceedings taken for their protection. (Mr. Trevelyan was unable to proceed further in consequence of the terrible noise.)

The Bishop said he was exceedingly sorry to have had to send for the police. (Hisses and yells.) It was very much against the grain to do so. It was evident he must call upon the police again. (Tumult.)

On the noise somewhat subsiding Mr. Trevelyan again essayed to speak. He said the way in which the meeting had been interrupted was an insult to the Bishop as well as to the great majority of the citizens of Exeter. (Here a bag of flour was thrown at the speaker, but fell short. Another bag, however, struck the Bishop full in the chest, covering him with flour, and also the face of Sir Wilfrid Lawson, who was sitting next to him.)

The Bishop, amidst hoots and yells, which made his voice inaudible beyond the limits of the platform, then put the motion, which was to the effect that no statesman could frame a measure dealing with the licensing laws, so as to grapple effectually with the evils of the liquor traffic, unless the measure included the valuable principle of popular control, enabling each district to veto the issue of all licences when enlightened public opinion should so determine. The motion was carried.

The Bishop: "We have finished our business to-night in spite of all."¹

The whole scene shows the public peril that may ensue if a trade which administers the supply and commands the services of intoxicating drinks increasingly become a compact and dominant

¹ *Exeter and Plymouth Gazette*, January 26, 1872.

influence. The Bishop's closing words are an apt text for the sermon of his whole life on the temperance question.

But though the occurrence impressed, it did not disturb him. While it lasted he was almost the only man present who did not lose self-control, and he returned home afterwards as if nothing had happened. He was not a member of the Alliance before the occurrence, and he did not join it afterwards. He waited until he found a suitable agent for working the diocese in the Church of England Temperance Society, re-formed on a double basis which included abstainers and non-abstainers. The inaugural meeting of this Society was held in Lambeth Palace on February 18, 1873. Bishop Temple was not present, but he sent a sympathetic apology for his absence. 'The gathering itself,' says Mr. Morcom, a faithful follower of Dr. Temple first at Exeter and then in London, both in the temperance movement and in all Church work, 'was memorable; it was the occasion of the public official adoption by the Church, in accordance with the recommendations of Convocation, of an organisation founded ten years before, as a private society, and now broadened to meet new requirements and to discharge a larger mission.'¹

With this action Bishop Temple was in thorough sympathy, and he took part in the formation in his own diocese of those parochial branches which, with the aid of a pastoral letter from the Archbishop issued immediately after the Lambeth meeting, began to spread throughout the country. "The Bishop," says Mr. Morcom, "was in these preliminary endeavours an irresistible power," always present wherever possible, even in the smallest places, "allaying anxieties by making it

¹ Memorandum from Rev. W. G. Morcom, Vicar of S. Michael's, Hackney.

evident that liberty of conscience would be respected in all,"¹ but always reiterating that a duty was laid upon all to take part in the battle against intemperance.

But the work was not easy. The Alliance meeting had rallied many to the side of the Bishop, even though not in full agreement; but there was plenty of indifference, if comparatively little active antagonism. It was not until July 26, 1880, that, in the judgment of the Bishop, opinion was sufficiently ripe for combining the parochial branches into one Diocesan Society, and thus giving the force of unity to sporadic effort. This proposal had been mooted and accepted by the Diocesan Conference four years before (October 1876), at the time when Mr. Woollcombe of Plympton secured the diocesan imprimatur for the formation of parochial branches; but the Bishop held his hand. When the day at last came it was opened by a service in the nave of the Cathedral. At a subsequent meeting in the Public Rooms the Bishop justified the delay. On the proposal of the Earl of Devon a Diocesan Branch of the Society was formed. The Bishop became President; Archdeacon Earle was appointed Secretary; and a general Committee was appointed for the diocese, with a Committee in each Archdeaconry to act under it. Gradually as the years went by the obstacles were removed. The Bishop's temperate and broad method of argument attracted numbers both of the clergy and laity to active co-operation and disarmed the opposition of others. Before he left Exeter the diocese was leavened with interest. The cause was broad-based and strong. Mr. Morcom, who succeeded Bishop Earle as Secretary, was summoned to a meeting of the Rural Deans at the Palace shortly after

¹ Memorandum from Rev. W. G. Morcom.

Dr. Temple became Bishop of London; his request that he might be allowed in every Deanery to plant temperance organisation in connexion with the Diocesan Society was at once granted, and he mentions that 'as he travelled home, the contrast with the early days of struggle and suspicion was present to his mind, and redoubled his admiration for the patience and wisdom of the leader.'¹

But the fulness of Dr. Temple's sympathy with the temperance movement was not bounded by the limits of Church organisation. After he left Exeter his conviction that total abstinence, not legislation, is the one simplest and surest cure for intemperance led him to become President of the National Temperance League; and while at Exeter he took much kindly interest in the Independent Order of Rechabites. Its combination of thrift with total abstinence imparted grit and directness, and appealed strongly to his love of the practical; but perhaps one sentence of his many addresses to the Order (August 5, 1885) discloses the secret of the attraction better than anything else: "I like in all cases, where I can, to stand upon the same floor with my fellow-men." He was at his best and most himself when the conventional was farthest off, and simplest things and people were nearest. It was in connexion with this organisation that he first signed a total abstinence pledge. "But he thought it every man's duty to look at the pounds, shillings, and pence of every society before becoming a member," and gave the officers of the Society, according to their own account, a very severe half-hour while he was engaged in this process. Having satisfied himself of the financial soundness of the Order, he became an honorary member (April 18, 1883),

¹ Memorandum from Rev. W. G. Morcom.

Mrs. Temple being enrolled at the same time. "Brother Temple" was constantly with his fellow-members while at Exeter, and visited them several times after he left; once (at their Jubilee celebration, 1888) he preached in Exeter Cathedral, and during the same visit made a tour with the Order to different centres in the county; once he squeezed in a special meeting in a day already overcrowded with other engagements. His last words to the Order sum up the whole of his temperance policy, and may be taken as his final message to temperance workers: "We shall not get at a single stroke all that we desire, but we shall get something, and every something shall be a step to something more; and that something more shall be an inspiration and an encouragement, and we shall begin to look forward, forward, forward, and ask what is the next step to take. Form your ranks, join together heartily, and press on. You cannot in the end fail of the victory, for the cause is the cause of God."¹ His brethren will not soon forget either the teaching or the man.

It would have been matter for surprise if Bishop Temple had taken no thought for the people's deliverance from a yet more deeply penetrating evil than intemperance. During his Episcopate the question of social purity was brought before the Diocesan Conference by the late Admiral Ryder and others. A committee was appointed which issued annual reports on the working of different remedial agencies. A special Vigilance Committee was also constituted in the city of Exeter. In all this work the Bishop took an earnest part, while at the same time making plain his sense of the danger of aggravating the evil by public discussion and action. To take no steps seemed to him a lesser evil than to take false

¹ Speech at Exeter, October 2, 1900.—*Devon Evening Express*.

steps. The evil could not be met by action so vigorous and direct as that which had marked his temperance campaign; but no one doubted his intense earnestness in regard to such subjects, and perhaps there was no single speech of his which made so lasting an impression on the diocese as that which he delivered on the kindred question of Marriage with the Deceased Wife's Sister (October 25, 1882). The effect was deepened for those who heard it by the force of emotion in the speaker. It raised the discussion of the subject to the highest level, and it was a revelation of the man. It may be well to let it speak for itself; it is the crown of all his efforts to sustain the purity of family life.

I find myself driven to the conclusion that it would be wrong to alter the law. I am very unwilling to come to that conclusion, because I feel so strongly how very serious a matter it is to interfere with the liberty of all Christian men and women in matters of this kind; but it seems to me that in all these cases the one consideration must be the good of the Christian community; and the great guide in judging what is best for a Christian community must be found in the best application you can make of the directions given in God's Word. I cannot escape from the conclusion that it was intended by God's Word to put a man and his wife in these respects precisely on the same footing. I cannot escape from the conclusion that this was included in what our Lord meant; and I look upon the law of Leviticus as not, indeed, laying this down, but as so distinctly and plainly corroborating it, that when the two are taken together there is no other way of interpreting God's Word that can be made consistent with itself. We are taught in the New Testament . . . that in the Old Law we should look, not indeed for the immediate and precise directions for the rule of our conduct, but for the principle and spirit which is to govern us. . . . What, then, do I find is the very fundamental idea, as I may say, of these prohibitions of marriage? It seems to me unmistakable that the purpose and object of them always has been to protect the purity of the family. It is, as a mere matter of fact, quite certain

that there is nothing which so surely protects the purity of the domestic circle as the impossibility of marriage within it, . . . and that anything which would interfere with the prohibition of marriage of those who are nearly related by blood would very seriously affect the purity of the home and the morality of all Christian people. And it seems to me further that, in the prohibitions of marriage within near degrees of affinity, the case is precisely the same. It is intended to throw over the wife's family precisely the same shield as that which is thrown over the man's own family. . . . And it is impossible in this matter to confine ourselves to the question as to what is to happen after a wife is dead. The wife is still living—shall it be possible that a man should be allowed to entertain those feelings towards her sister which may end in marriage afterwards? and yet if marriage be thus allowed, such feelings, such temptations, such natural impulses of the flesh are absolutely impossible to prevent. I know of no other way by which they can be restrained than by the law of the Church as it now stands. Of course this is only one particular instance, and it is proposed to relax the law only in one particular case, but we all know that in matters of this sort that changes always come by degrees. There are very many men who now advocate this marriage who would be shocked by the idea of a man marrying his step-daughter, . . . and the sense of this is strong enough at present to make the great majority of us feel that there is something horrible in allowing a marriage, first with the woman and then with her daughter. But if you begin by altering the law in this particular, how long will this horror last? You may depend upon it that by and by a great many men will begin to question each restraint in its turn. Soon a large number will feel that they have no principle to guide them at all, and that this is a mere question of expediency; and that, inasmuch as it is a mere question of expediency, we have no right to impose restraint on one another. . . . It seems to me that it is imperative to require that, before you make any change in the law of marriage, you should provide that the change shall be made, not in detail, but by a definite rule, a definite principle, which will show precisely where you stop; because otherwise it is certain that these things creep on and on; . . . the moral sense of people left without any kind of restraint cannot be trusted long. . . . I do not mean that the passing of this law

would immediately be followed by great impurity, but I do mean to say this, that the passing of this law would tend to introduce the possibility and the probability of many impurities, seductions, and adulteries of a new and peculiar kind, such as adultery with the wife's nearest relations. . . . I cannot help feeling that the maintenance of the present law is required if we desire to maintain the sanctity of the marriage tie, and much as I feel the force of what has been said on the other side, I cannot bring myself to any other conclusion. I do not think that I have come to that conclusion from any desire whatever to agree with other people who have already come to the same conclusion. I do not think it is a mere professional feeling in the slightest degree. I do not think I have been moved by finding the great majority of my brethren on that side. I do not feel that I should flinch, if I had come to the opposite conclusion, from saying so fearlessly here. But I have been compelled to it by the course of my own study and consideration of the subject. . . . Even considering marriage as a civil institution, yet viewing the present law as I do, as necessary for the defence of domestic purity, I say that the liberty of the individual ought to be restrained for the general good. . . . Now I have said what I have said because I thought it a duty, and I am grateful to you for having heard me in silence, because it is a subject which I do not like to have handled with either applause or disapprobation. It seems to me too deeply and too nearly to touch the most vital of all questions that Christians can handle—the purity of the body. I do not hesitate to acknowledge that there are men who take the other view—men who are really good, really high-minded, high-principled men, and I feel strongly the pain of differing from them; but it is not a matter upon which hesitation appears to me to be possible when conviction has been attained. Most deeply do I mourn over the mischief which has been done by the Roman Catholic Church in this matter—for the mischief began there. When the integrity of the law was broken down by dispensations, of course it necessarily followed that there would be those who would be ready to grant themselves "dispensations. . . . The mischief has been done, and I mourn over it as a mischief which has been most serious in its character, and has had consequences which certainly were never intended by those who began it. Of course as things are it may be the case that the law may be passed, and the rule hitherto governing our marriages

will, in that case, be relaxed. What will be the result is in God's hands, but those who feel how serious the matter is, ought, I think, to do their best to impress their convictions upon public opinion generally, and, if possible, prevent all that seems to be so immediately threatened. Perhaps if we had been somewhat more careful to explain the doctrine of the Church as soon as ever it was first questioned; perhaps if the clergy had earlier taken it in hand, we might have done much to make people understand better than they seem to do now what is the ground on which the present law is maintained. Even yet I think we may do something. At any rate it seems to me that we ought to do what we can. I will now put the question, and may I ask you, simply as a matter of feeling, to vote without any further demonstration of opinion. (*Vide* vol. ii. p. 343.)

(The motion was then put and carried.)

Bishop Temple's sympathy with human life was not satisfied by efforts to purify it from moral evils. Evil was cast out in order to make room for higher growths. He believed in the ascent of man in fellowship with the fulness of his life, and in the close connexion between each step in the process; intellectual and moral progress were bound together, and there were points in which the one shaded off into the other. He was interested in those societies which occupied this borderland, and in later days gave much counsel as to the formation of the Church of England Men's Society. At Exeter he took thought for its forerunner, the Young Men's Friendly Society, and discussed it in the Diocesan and Ruridecanal Conferences. But his most noteworthy action at Exeter in this connexion was the formation of a Society for the promotion of good manners, under the title of the *Semper Fidelis* Society. In some respects Bishop Temple was not the natural patron for such an organisation; but the Society took as its motto Tennyson's lines—

For Manners are not idle, but the fruit
Of loyal nature, and of noble mind.

In this sense, Frederick Temple exemplified good manners more than most men. Few had a finer instinct for doing a kindness with delicacy, or for handling the graver issues, and tending the deeper sorrows of life: at such times the nobility of the man's nature came out. How fully in his place he was as head of such a society may be gathered from his admirable address at the inaugural meeting, of which the concluding passage is here given:—

. . . It is practice that makes perfect in these things. And so too by practice a man at last attains to that ease and grace of manners which is the crown of all. For the final perfection of Good Manners consists in forgetting ourselves altogether; in not only perpetually sacrificing our own pleasure and comfort, but in maintaining Self-Control and Self-Respect, instinctively without thinking about it. What is more beautiful than the good manners in which there is no trace left of Self-Consciousness, but all is kindness, simplicity, and ease?

Last of all let this be said. Good Manners give the last grace and finish to good conduct. They are, when perfect, the visible flower and bloom of inward excellence; of excellence which has so taken possession of the man as to pervade his being and colour the minutest details of his life. They sweeten all social intercourse and contribute to human happiness beyond all proportion to the effort of self-discipline which they cost. The true man will desire to remember at every moment of his life the Scriptural precept, "Be courteous."¹

The same desire to aid the gradual elevation of human life, and to enlarge the conception of a bishop's office, was seen in the delivery of frequent addresses to mutual improvement and kindred societies. One of these given at Plymouth has already been noted.² In his view there were higher things than culture, but sympathy with it was part of his nature, and this sympathy was not the least among his qualifications to be a bishop in the Church of Christ.

¹ *Good Manners*, by the Right Rev. The Lord Bishop of Exeter. (S.P.C.K.)

² *Supra*, p. 324.

CHAPTER VIII (*continued*)

THE BISHOP AND THE PEOPLE (*Spiritual Life*)

Church Extension in Plymouth—Plymouth Mission, 1877 —
“Priesthood” of the laity—Lay readers—Parochial Councils
—Sacredness of lay life.

LACK of spirituality was sometimes imputed to Dr. Temple. The criticism was due to a certain hardness of manner combined with a natural reserve of character and dread of unreal words; but if his own definition of spirituality may be taken—devotion of the conscience, heart, and will to Christ¹—he was amongst the most spiritually minded of men. It was impossible for him to stop short at efforts for moral elevation or mental culture; his aim for the people was “the glorious liberty of the sons of God.” While conscious of how little could be done by one man in a single generation, this final end was a constant inspiration. The thought leads to consideration of his work on behalf of Church Extension, and the promotion of spiritual life in large centres.

The problem in its fulness was not presented to him until he became Bishop of London. The fullest expression of it in Devonshire was to be found in the three towns, *i.e.* Plymouth, Stone-

¹ See Temple's *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 247-251.

house, and Devonport.¹ During the years between 1871 (shortly after he came to Exeter) and 1903 (shortly after his death), the population in this centre had grown from 132,792 to 196,734—viz. at a rate approximating to 50 per cent. There had been growth previously, and a scheme of Bishop Phillpotts (1840-50) had endeavoured to deal with it. But since then the increase had been more rapid, and it may be mentioned, as an illustration, that S. Peter's Church, which at that time was transferred from its original Nonconformist connexion and converted into a church, was approached through fields; and that the parish which had fields in its area during the episcopate of Bishop Phillpotts comprehended a population of 12,000 when his successor came into the see. At the beginning of the nineteenth century the only two parishes were S. Andrew's and Charles, and the appointment to these livings was in the hand of the Corporation. After the repeal (1828) of the Test and Corporation Act the patronage was transferred, first to private individuals, and then to a private Trust. District churches were eventually built; but, except in the case of three districts constituted under the "Peel" and "Blandford" Acts (1843, 1844, and 1856), the clergymen in these were nominees of the incumbents of the original parishes.

The problem presented to Bishop Temple for solution was sufficiently difficult. There was a large and rapidly increasing population. A large proportion of it was poor, and most of it, as is always the case in a naval and military centre, was shifting; there were not many wealthy inhabitants, and where the power of help was not wanting, the interest created by long residence and family

¹ The chief authorities for the work recorded in this chapter are memoranda by Archdeacon Wilkinson, the Rev. Prebendary Bird, Mr. John Shelly, and the Reports of the Three Towns Church Extension Society.

connexion was often lacking. Sailors and soldiers came and went, but the classes which may be regarded as the camp followers of a garrison town and seaport were always in evidence. Much good work was being done to meet these needs, but neither from the educational nor spiritual point of view was the supply adequate. The whole position was complicated by a bad Patronage system, which resulted in contention and excess, and rendered it exceedingly difficult to bring laity and clergy together with anything resembling unity of Church action. The Church was weak, but dissent was strong, and the leaders of thought and work were largely to be found amongst Nonconformists.

It did not seem probable at first that the coming of Dr. Temple would improve the situation. The feeling against him ran high at Plymouth as at Exeter, but the urgency of the need did not admit of delay. A question of Church organisation like the revival of the Cornish Bishopric, or an educational policy, might wait; but the supply of spiritual needs in a great centre of human life touched the essence of a bishop's work and duties, and must be dealt with at once. Accordingly, within two years of his consecration the Bishop summoned the clergy of the Three Towns to meet (September 5, 1871) 'for the consideration of the condition of the Church therein and of the means to remedy deficiencies.' This meeting was followed by others of a preliminary character, and on April 22 of the following year (1872) a public meeting was held, attended by laity as well as clergy, at which a Church Extension Society for Plymouth was constituted, and power was given to the committee to frame rules. It is significant that the first rules were very general in their character, and did not touch the essential question of Patronage. The fact was that, while all soon began to respond

to the touch of the Bishop's wise influence, and to recognise the ability of his management, differences of view appeared from the outset, which required all his skill and patient firmness to adjust. Of these the most crucial was the Patronage question. "Party and local feeling," says Archdeacon Wilkinson, "were aroused, and for a time it seemed doubtful whether a solution might be found. Here the skill, the tact, the force of character, and the good sense of the Bishop were of great value, and a scheme of Patronage was agreed upon, which upon the whole has worked well." It was expressed in the following terms:—"That the Patronage of each of the new churches shall be vested in the incumbent of the parish from which the district is taken, and in three lay trustees appointed for life, *with* a reference to the Bishop in case of equality of votes." It may be stated in this connexion that the original scheme agreed upon had included the Bishop *ex officio* as one of the trustees, and that he accepted the modification, in order to secure unanimity. 'Practically the scheme left the Patronage in the hands of the incumbent of the Mother Church.' It was decided that the sittings in the new churches should be free. The pages of the carefully kept Minute-Book¹ afford the best evidence of the debt which Plymouth owes to the Bishop. He was seldom absent from any important meeting of the committee during the whole of his episcopate; he made personal applications whenever influential support could be gained; again and again he renews failing courage with his patient strength; he set the example of reliance upon persistent and continuous effort. To him is referred each knotty point for solution, and almost without knowing it men find that they have accepted as universal

¹ The secretary of the Church Extension Society was the Rev. James Metcalfe, Vicar of Christ Church, Plymouth.

arbiter one whom they first received with general suspicion. The actual result was the formation of four new districts with corresponding churches—All Saints', S. Matthew's (Stonehouse), S. Mark's (Ford), and S. Jude's. The success was considerable, but it might have been greater if the diocese as a whole had given the same full co-operation which a few years later was accorded to the scheme for reviving the Cornish Bishopric. But though the Bishop made frequent appeals, and his request that the Harvest Offerings throughout the diocese might be given to the Plymouth scheme met with general response, "the Committee find reason to regret," in their third annual report, "that the increased support and pecuniary assistance, which they looked for, have not been given them so fully as they had hoped by the Churchmen of the diocese." Was the contrast due in any way to the fact that in the Truro case the help of the Diocesan Conference was sought, and enabled the Bishop to say that he had the diocese at his back, while in the case of Plymouth the question was crowded out from the discussions of the Diocesan Conference in its first session,¹ and a proposal previously made by the Bishop to the Plymouth committee, which suggested that they "should consider whether it was desirable to hold a public meeting at once, or to wait till after the Diocesan Conference," was not taken up?² Whatever success the work obtained was largely due to the thoroughness and strength of the leader, and his power to inspire and sustain others; where it failed, the failure must be attributed to an inability fully to respond all at

¹ *Supra*, p. 371. One of the resolutions on the agenda which was not discussed owing to want of time was: "That this Committee be instructed to pay special attention in the first instance to the work already begun in Plymouth, Stonehouse, and Devqohport."

² Minute-Book, Committee meeting, March 23, 1872.

once to a great call. But inspiration did not wholly die, and the work continues still.

The Church Extension Scheme was not the full measure of the Bishop's labour at Plymouth. Besides giving new life and improved system to primary education in the Three Towns, he was, as a previous chapter has noted,¹ the originator and mainstay of its chief secondary schools. He was a tower of strength in the temperance work; he held Quiet Days for the clergy, and made personal visitations of the parishes, giving addresses to the church-workers therein; the Confirmations were increased in number and frequency, and held often in the evening hours, to suit the needs of working people. All was systematised and periodical, but all was work. "He never spared himself," says Dr. Wilkinson, "as to time or labour, but endeavoured in every way to raise to a higher level the religion and the education of the people of the Three Towns; it is impossible to overestimate the influence of his character and the impression produced on all classes by his varied addresses and devoted work. He will never be forgotten by those who knew him and loved him as a Christian man, a friend, and a Bishop."²

After these warm words of a personal friend and fellow-labourer, it may be well to give a criticism of the Bishop's work at Plymouth from a somewhat more external point of view:—

I was one of those who sympathised with Archdeacon Freeman in his opposition to the appointment of Dr. Temple to Exeter, but I was influenced on the other hand by the strong advice of a relative of mine, who was also a friend of the Archdeacon's, that Dr. Temple, having been consecrated, should be cordially received, and was quite prepared to see

¹ *Supra*, p. 340.

² Memorandum from Dr. Wilkinson, Archdeacon of Totnes and late Vicar of S. Andrew's, Plymouth.

or make the best. One sentence in his *Essay in Essays and Reviews*—"We shall best imitate the Early Church, not by doing what she did, but by doing as she did"¹—had so much influenced me at an important crisis of my life, that my personal prejudice was all in favour of the writer. But like most Churchmen in Plymouth, I think I was not favourably impressed or attracted by him at first. . . . The hardness of his manner offended some Church people, and disappointed others who had hoped that the personal influence of a new Bishop might unite and strengthen the Church in Plymouth. He soon, however, put himself at the head of a movement for building new churches, of which there was great need in the three towns. He insisted on the churches being free and open, and was perfectly fair and impartial in his support of the schemes both of High and Low Churchmen. This, I think, led Churchmen of both parties to trust him even before they learned to like him. The success of that church-building scheme was due very much to his determination. It was of this, however, his determination and the strength of his will, rather than any spiritual influence that people took notice. I remember very well his first Confirmation addresses. They were earnest, almost laboured, but the theme of them was the power of the Will—"You are going out into life, you will have new duties, will meet new temptations, it will be a struggle and a fight, but you can conquer if you will—you must nerve yourself and gather up your strength for the battle." . . . In later addresses he insisted no less strongly on the struggle, but said plainly that the struggle would fail unless it were inspired by the grace of the Holy Spirit, and that this grace must be sought and would be received in the Ordinances of the Church, and particularly in our Lord's special gift of Himself in the Holy Communion. . . . It may be only that people got used to him as years went on, but I think there was more than this . . . and that at least he showed more freely a tenderness and spirituality which may always have been latent, but was at first effectually hidden by the power of his character and the strength of his will. On two occasions I was greatly struck, and no doubt others will tell you of this, by the revelation of tenderness and depth of feeling in speeches at the Diocesan Conference. The first was when the question of Temperance was being

¹ *Essays and Reviews*, p. 30: "Education of the World"—"To copy the Early Church is to do as she did, not what she did."

discussed, and I said that impurity wrought perhaps greater havoc than intemperance. He spoke of this, and especially of the need of giving warning to the young, with very deep feeling. The other was when he made his well-known speech on marriage with a deceased wife's sister.¹ The power of it must be evident to all readers, but those who heard it can never forget the earnestness, even to tears, the manner in which he checked the beginning of applause, saying that he could not bear it, that the subject was too serious. A striking instance of thoughtful kindness hidden by his brusque manner was told me by a Cornish clergyman who died some years ago. The Bishop was confirming in the parish, and the clergyman told him of a schoolmistress who had lately left and gone to a parish which the Bishop was to visit in a few days. She was in some distress and despondent about her work, and the clergyman asked the Bishop if he could speak to her. The only answer was, "I don't suppose I shall see her," but not long afterwards the clergyman had a letter from the mistress saying that the Bishop had been there, and part of his address seemed exactly to meet her case, and she had been so much consoled and strengthened by it.

The Bishop had no desire for the Church Congress² which met at Plymouth in 1876—he said plainly that he did not believe in Congresses, and his opening address showed this. But as it went on I think his opinion altered. Certainly the Congress gave a great impetus to Church life and work in Plymouth. He was an excellent Chairman, watchful, firm, and, what one would not so much have expected, patient. . . .

To me personally he was again and again most kind, and I found the hardness and brusqueness of his manner disappear in discussions of business, both Church and secular, which I had with him. . . .

Very few people . . . in Plymouth . . . got to know him, but a great many learnt to admire him and believe in him and to trust him, and this, I think, was what he felt and meant when he wrote to me as he was leaving Exeter for London, "When shall I ever find such friends again?"³

Perhaps the work would have been no less effective, while the knowledge of him would have

¹ *Supra*, p. 486.

² *Infra*, p. 606.

³ Memorandum from Mr. John Shelly of Plymouth.

been fuller, if a meeting here and there had been exchanged for a quiet evening of personal intercourse; but nothing of the unique personality could have been spared, and the isolation made it more striking. In his view fellowship in work was the natural road to fellowship in spirit. After all there was that in the lifelong attitude of detachment and pure service which unconsciously made its own appeal for the friendship and sympathy of others.

Much of the work at Plymouth touched organisation only, but he looked deeper. Reviewing in one of his later charges at Exeter (1888) the leading characteristics of the time as noted during his Episcopate, he says :—

“The present day is a day of great intellectual activity. There is hardly any doctrine which is not questioned and challenged to defend itself. There is hardly any institution which is not asked to show its reason for existence. There is hardly any practice which is not required to prove its character by its fruits. And most of this incessant criticism of all things divine and human is not, as such criticisms ought to be, quiet, patient, deliberate, and as far as possible, profound; but noisy, restless, hasty, superficial. . . . Whatever there may be underneath, there is undeniably before our eyes a swelling tide of restless and superficial questioning of all truth and all authority.

But, further, side by side with this great intellectual activity there is (as there always has been) a corresponding vehemence of emotional activity.¹

He knew the dangers which wait upon excited feelings, but he knew also their use, and the truth was that there was always in him much of the evangelistic spirit. Shortly after his coming to Exeter, when his doctrinal position was still a matter of much discussion, an earnest but somewhat formal theologian expressed his belief that all the

¹ Charge delivered by Bishop Temple in 1888.

theology which the new Bishop possessed was a somewhat loose evangelicalism. There were more things in Dr. Temple's creed than he dreamt of, but the criticism did at any rate give a description, though inadequate, of part of it—his firm hold on the Cross of Christ, and his conviction that in the simple preaching of it lay the great strength of Christianity. He never spoke with deeper feeling to his boys at Rugby than on Good Friday;¹ his power to sway great masses was at its highest in the pathos of his appeals to the love of God in Christ. There was something of the same touch of character in the readiness with which he turned to sections of the Temperance body, where simple words on this theme were most sure to find home and response. He took part in Home Missions sparingly, because of his dread of letting the emotional reserve within him run dry, and of being called upon to produce feeling "to order"; but whenever he spoke at such times his words were "with power." He was a prime mover in the Exeter Mission of 1875; into the Plymouth Mission of 1877, which was supplemental to the Church Extension movement, he threw himself with all his spiritual force, making it plain that he well knew the need of the inner power to give life to external organisation. "In this Mission," says Dr. Wilkinson, "public interest and deep feeling in the Three Towns were excited to a greater extent than was ever known before. To all the work he lent his aid: the Mission lasted for more than a week, and his interest and co-operation continued to its close."² At all such times he felt the strain to be very great—the spiritual tension was evident to all, and he relied largely on spiritual means of grace to help him through. There was

¹ See "Rugby" Memoir, p. 244.

² Memorandum from Archdeacon Wilkinson.

some question during the Mission as to the frequency with which the Holy Communion should be celebrated. "Where can I find a daily Communion?" he asked; "I cannot do such work as this without it." The words, look, and tone were enough: the point was settled.

But he was fully alive to the need of following up the work of missions.

If we wish to secure that what we do shall have a permanent value, it seems to me that we must make great efforts to follow all such excitement, of whatever kind, by careful and diligent instruction in those truths by which Christians ought to live; and in these days, more than any others. The very fact that we are called upon to speak to people's hearts, makes it still more imperative that we should also speak to their understandings, and endeavour to give them something to which they may hold fast in spite of all fluctuations of feeling.¹

And when men had been lifted into something of Christian life, he would have them rise to Church fellowship and realise the priesthood of the laity. The "royal priesthood" was the whole body of the faithful, and it needed organic expression. The question of the form to be given to it was a topic which Bishop Temple more than once brought before his Conferences, both diocesan and rural-decanal. His last word on the subject to the Exeter Diocese is spoken in his charge in 1884:—

We all know the need there is in the Church for more labourers in the work of visiting, teaching, preaching, and leading united prayers. The difficulty has made many of us groan for years past, and we know that in many large centres of population the people must have gone off to practical heathenism if the Nonconformists had not stepped in to do the work which was quite beyond our reach. The immense growth of Nonconformity during this century is really

due to this fact. Our ministry has not grown with our people, and the work simply could not be done for lack of means to do it. We are even yet but slowly awakening to the need; I do not think we are all awake to it now. We want more men. . . .

Now it has been suggested that we might make more use of lay assistants or Scripture readers than we do, and that, in the second place, we might have more deacons at command, if we were content to recognise them as a distinct order, and not require of them very much the same knowledge, and very much the same service as we require in the priesthood.

Both these suggestions have been the subject of careful inquiry time after time by committees of our Convocation in both provinces. . . .

It is not intended that the standard now required for ordination of the priesthood should be in any degree lowered. These deacons would, for the most part, remain deacons permanently. Some, however, might desire after a time to enter the priesthood. And if they had done good service, there would be no objection whatever to their seeking the higher office. But they would have to fulfil two conditions. In the first place, for a whole year, at *least*, and if not graduates, for four years, they would have to give up their whole time to the work of the ministry, and not merely such portion of it as they had originally agreed to give. And in the second place, they would have to pass the same examinations as other priests, and would have to show such a knowledge of Greek as would enable them to read, understand, and explain the Greek Testament.

Now it remains to be seen whether we can obtain any candidates for the diaconate on this footing. Here, even still more than in the case of the lay readers, the towns might help the country parishes. The men that I have been describing are mostly to be found in the towns. And certainly there are very few things that a man of leisure and independent means can do, and do without much strain, of greater value than this. How many hamlets might have services which now have none! How many old people who now find the parish church quite out of reach, might in this way find the inestimable blessing of regular worship close to their doors! We can offer these deacons no money. The very purpose of the whole proposal is to endeavour to obtain gratuitous ministerial labour. There must be men who

have the time to spare and the gifts for the work, and if God should touch their hearts with a sense of the reality of the need, I hope and pray that they will not hold back.¹

The sense of need has grown since these words were spoken, and the growth of the public opinion of the Church makes the whole subject more ripe for settlement; but twenty years ago matters were not far advanced, and Bishop Temple was a pioneer. He was the first of the Bishops of Exeter, of more modern times to license lay readers in the diocese. The total number licensed during his Episcopate amounted to 238. The development under his successors has been considerable, and the organisation is now a recognised institution of the diocese with large possibilities of future growth before it. Bishop Temple was the founder.

He was also one of the first of the bishops to recommend the formation of Parochial Councils. The time had not yet come when he could urge with effect his long-cherished project of a representative Lay Body for the Church at large; but it was open for him as a diocesan to treat the question in its relation to the parish, and he deals with it in the charge (1884) to which reference has already been made. With his usual desire to avoid hasty steps he recommends a policy which starts from what is already in existence.

I think that we shall be most likely to form good parochial councils by using the sidesmen whom the canons permit us to elect, and tell us how to elect. The sidesmen are to be elected just as the churchwardens are to be elected; that is, jointly by the rector, or vicar, and the parishioners. But there is this important difference. If the vicar, or rector, on the one side, and the parishioners on the other, do not agree in their choice of men to be churchwardens, the canon orders that the rector, or vicar, shall appoint one, and the parishioners the other. And in many places it has become a settled custom to proceed in this way,

¹ Charge of Bishop Temple, delivered 1884.

and the clergyman and parishioners do not even attempt to agree upon both churchwardens, but proceed at once, each to nominate one. But in the election of sidesmen, if the clergyman and parishioners cannot agree, the matter must be referred to the bishop, and the bishop appoints. The result is, that any attempt to force, on either side, very objectionable sidesmen can always be defeated. In any parish where disputes run high, it will always be possible to prevent the election from taking a merely party character. The bishop is bound, if called in, to appoint such sidesmen as are likely to promote peace, to conciliate opposition, to give all aid and sympathy to whatever tends to sober, earnest religion. I think, with this protection ready in case of need, the clergy would find it easier to form a parochial council by the election of sidesmen than in any other way. . . .

In all cases the purpose must be to take our people with us, to make them understand, as far as possible, why we do what we are doing, and to secure their hearty assent and, if possible, concurrence and co-operation.

There will be not a few parishes in which nothing of this sort can yet be done. There are neither the materials nor the need for any such parochial council. But I think the clergy will do well to bear in mind everywhere that it is good for all Christian people to be drawn into direct Christian work, and it is good for Church people to feel that they are living members of the Church; quite independent of the value of what they may do, it is good that they and no others should do it. A parish ought to have a spiritual life of its own, and ought to be a body and not a mere aggregation of separate units. The clergy are everywhere more active than they were. It is time to draw the people into the current of that activity.¹

In this, as in the previous case of licensed lay readers, things have gone forward since the Bishop's words were uttered, but his remarks are not out of date, for they speak the spirit of wisdom which is the permanent guide for the settlement of all such subjects.

But beneath all his desire for the organisation of the lay life of the Church was his belief in the sanctity of lay life itself. The priesthood was in

¹ Charge delivered by Bishop Temple, 1884.

the whole body, and primarily each man was a priest, not because of what he did, but in virtue of what he was—a member of Christ. Definite functions were a sign of life, but they were not the life itself—necessary outcomes of vitality, but not the principle of vitality. This is the thought behind such words as these:—

What is a good Churchman? The first and most special characteristic of a good Churchman is, that in every respect he shows that he has a conscience. He is just, he is upright, he is true, he takes nothing on himself, he upholds with all his strength what he reads in the Bible to be good. A good Churchman ought to be known more than any other by his trustworthiness, and by his kindness to all around him; and whilst this is the character that he shows everywhere, to those who know him well and come to closer intimacy, he presents the character of a God-fearing man, a man who loves the Lord, not over-ready, perhaps, to talk about that love, but cherishing deep in his heart, and showing in whatever he does say that he loves the Lord, and that he loves the Lord's Church, because there he finds the Lord's teaching, there he finds the Lord's worship, the Lord's sacraments. If the laity could convince England that these are the men whom the Church produces, how far it would go to make it impossible to hurt such a Church as that.¹

A continuous study of Bishop Temple's mind shows that there never was a time when he did not see that Christian doctrine was an essential of Christian faith, and his sense of the need of definite, though not minute, exposition of doctrine grew with deepening experience. But always for him Christian creed was not a system, but a life; and it was the robustness of tone resulting from this conviction which commended him as a guide to the lay mind. In his relations with his people the Bishop's supreme aim was to leaven all ranks with a sense of the religiousness of all life. The offering of the life was the fullest expression of the priesthood of the laity.

¹ Charge delivered by Bishop Temple, 1884.

CHAPTER IX

THE BISHOP AT HOME

The Palace—The chapel—Home life—Miss Temple—Marriage—The Cathedral—Restoration—Reredos—Royal Commission on Cathedrals—Relation of the Cathedral to the diocese—Amalgamation of city parishes—Tiverton parochial system.

BISHOP TEMPLE combined special characteristics of two of his most distinguished predecessors. Like Bishop Stapeldon, he had many and wide interests; but, like Bishop Grandisson, he was emphatically a diocesan bishop. Concentration, not diffusiveness, was the keynote. It was an outcome of the compact unity of his character. One illustration was the conviction that there must be one centre for the diocese, and that for an historic Church that centre must be the Cathedral city, with its associations and traditions. On this belief he acted, both at Exeter and Canterbury. The Bishop was to issue forth in all directions on all kinds of work; but he presided over not a Mission, but a Church; there must be a centre, and the Bishop's seat at the centre must be a home. With some sides of social life Dr. Temple had no special affinities, but its fundamental principle was part of himself; for him social life began in the home; the family was the basis on which society rested. His love of home was in large measure the explanation of his homeliness of

manner. To know him it was necessary to see him in the undress of home life. It was not that there was any abandonment or self-forgetfulness—far less any of the expressions of small selfishness which sometimes creep into family circles. Regularity (not troublesome, but prompt) was the order of the day; all the little details as to dress and punctuality which helped to keep refinement and order in a busy life were observed. Sometimes, perhaps, the quickness with which one engagement followed upon the heels of another was a little trying to steady-going ordinary mortals; an occasional sigh might be heard, “I can’t get hold of either the Bishop or the dinner; it is all gobble and go at the Palace.” But there was full compensation in the freedom and simplicity which placed every one at his ease. Above all, it was the home of duty, and the whole atmosphere was quietly religious. No social amenities or business engagements interfered with the daily observance of family prayer, at which, both morning and evening, the whole household gathered.¹

The Palace at Exeter was the first of his Episcopal homes; he adapted it for his purpose, and he liked it well. The actual date of its erection cannot be fixed with exactness, but it is recorded in the archives of Exeter Cathedral that Bishop Bruere gave a site for the Chapter-house, of which he was the builder, “in orto nostro, juxta turrim Sct. Johannis.”² The mention of the garden seems to imply a contiguous building, and we know from Bronescombe’s *Register* that Bishop Blondy died in the Palace in the middle of

¹ In this connexion may be noticed the Bishop’s love for the more homely and ordinary routine of religious life. It was always his custom to attend his parish church, and to preserve the due relation between the church and the home. The worship of the former was kept distinct from the devotions of the latter.

² *Exeter Cathedral Archives*, No. 2084.

the thirteenth century.¹ During the Commonwealth the Palace appears to have passed into the hands of the city authorities, and by them to have been made over to the Governors of S. John's Hospital, who leased it to a sugar-baker; but at the time of the Restoration, Bishop Seth Ward "retrieved" it out of the hands of the sugar-baker, repaired it, and made it habitable.² It has suffered alterations and vicissitudes since its first erection, but the Early English character of the original architecture still remains, in central arch and chapel window as its main and most attractive feature. The mediæval bishops divided their time between residence in the Palace and visits to their numerous manors. Bronescombe had his home at Clyst S. Mary, where the motto over the gateway, "Janua patet : Cor magis," testified to the character of the man, and gave his successors an indication of the kind of hospitality to which a bishop must be given. Stapeldon by his will shows that he is an apt disciple, and leaves directions that a hundred poor shall be fed in the hall, or at the gate of Exeter Palace.³ Quivil was continually at the Palace,⁴ as was natural for one who made the Cathedral his main charge. That busy overseer, Bishop Grandisson, was perpetually travelling from manor to manor, and found his favourite residence at Chudleigh.⁵ Of the 270 letters in Part I. of his *Register*, ranging over a period of more than ten years, only three or four are dated from Exeter; most of them are written at Chudleigh, and some at Clyst S. Mary. In mediæval times the Palace appears to have been an occasional residence to many, and a regular home to some. After the

¹ Oliver's *Lives of the Bishops of Exeter*, pp. 38-39.

² Dr. Pope's *Biography*. See Oliver, p. 259.

³ Oliver, p. 63.

⁴ Quivil's *Episcopal Register* (Hingeston-Randolph), p. xxi.

⁵ Oliver, p. 82.

Reformation it was the habitual place of residence of the bishop.¹ In confirmation it may be said that the portraits of the bishops which hang in the Palace are those of post-Reformation prelates. The majority of those who have held the See since the Commonwealth find their place in the series. The chief personal memorial of the mediæval bishops is the "splendid"² stone mantelpiece of Bishop Peter Courtenay (1478) which now stands in the old hall, converted into a dining-room. It is elaborately adorned with heraldic sculptures which tell their own tale of the Courtenay family, and of its connexion, long and large, with diocesan and national history. Blackall, Weston, and Lavington are all known to have lived at the Palace. Dr. Oliver speaks of Bishop Keppel as "this affable, open-hearted, bountiful prelate," and mentions that he "expended considerable sums on the improvement of the Palace."³ That Bishop Ross had his home at the Palace, and made it a home to others, is plain from John Wesley's commendation. He praises the lovely situation, and speaks of the Palace as covered with trees and as rural and retired as if it were in the country. The eulogy embraces not the situation only, but the whole style of the Bishop's establishment: "The plainness of the furniture, not costly or showy, but just fit for a Christian Bishop; the dinner sufficient, but not redundant; plain and good, but not delicate: the propriety of the company—five clergymen and four of the aldermen." He has a good word for the Bishop himself and for the Cathedral service: "The genuine, unaffected courtesy of the Bishop," who, he hopes, "will be a blessing to the whole diocese," is greatly to his mind, and he was "much pleased with the

¹ Memorandum from Chancellor Edmonds.

² Oliver, p. 255.

³ *Ibid.* p. 163.

decent behaviour of the whole congregation at the Cathedral; as also with the solemn music at the post-communion, one of the finest compositions I ever heard.”¹ But non-residence was frequent in the later times. Bishop Bethell, transferred from the See of Gloucester, had hardly seen the Diocese of Exeter when he was translated in the same year (1830) to the Bishopric of Bangor; and, “in consequence either of the non-residence, or the translation to richer Sees of several of his predecessors, the Exeter Palace had been suffered to go so much out of repair as scarcely to be habitable.”² When Dr. Phillpotts succeeded him, he “found the Palace in a very unfit state to receive him; but he has restored it in a most creditable manner.”³ In the process he added to the library an old Gothic oriel window rescued from a dwelling-place in the city. The window is filled with stained glass containing emblems and crests connected with former bishops and dignitaries.

But though Bishop Phillpotts enriched the Palace he did not live in it. For many years before his death his residence was at Bishopstowe in Torquay. The succession of Dr. Temple to Exeter was the coming home of its Bishop. To make the Palace a home some change of structure was required; but the chief thing to be done was to open out the ground, and to let in light, and introduce something of home comfort into the building. It was necessary to include the private chapel of the Palace in the work of renewal. “The most ancient part” of the Palace, says Dr. Oliver, “is the Chapel of S. Mary. Its east window, with its three lancets of the Earliest English style, is singularly rich and graceful.”⁴ It is probably a debt which, like the Chapter-

¹ Wesley's *Journal*. Chancellor Edmonds' Memorandum.

² Oliver, p. 167.

³ *Ibid.* p. 168.

⁴ *Ibid.* p. 254.

house, the See owed to Bishop Bruere. It was founded as a chantry chapel for perpetual prayers for the departed bishops. The Dean and Chapter made an annual offering to it of wax candles on the Festival of S. Faith (October 6), and Alwyngton and Harberton churches were under charges to assist in supporting the officiating chaplain. Here in mediæval times a musical service was regularly rendered by chaplain and choir. A canon leaves a legacy to defray costs, and a Pope commends a bishop's (Arundell, 1502) piety for maintaining the daily service :—

*Cujus In Deum pietatem quotidianus Dei in suo sacello cultus ostendit; tot suis capellanis ac domesticis, cum symphoniacis pueris angelicam harmoniam in Dei ac Dive Virginis laudem, bis quotidie canoris vocibus vocalique jubilo efficientibus.*¹

The chapel has been the shrine of many solemnities, some of which have touched both individual and ecclesiastical life very closely. In it a chancellor of the Cathedral in the thirteenth century cleared himself of a charge of simoniacal action in the disposal of patronage; in it hands have been laid on many generations of candidates for Holy Orders.

The continuity of sacred function in this chapel was preserved and strengthened by Bishop Temple. Here he sanctified his home by the service of daily family prayer; here those who were about to receive Holy Orders met for the fellowship and strength of Holy Communion, and for the Bishop's words of inspiration and counsel; here in hours of quiet retreat the clergy of the diocese were encouraged by the same voice "to stir up the gift" that was in them. The Palace Chapel was the spot in which home and diocese met, and where individual

¹ Oliver, pp. 254-255.

clergymen most fully felt the presence of the spiritual father. Bishop Phillpotts occasionally used the Chapel for ordinations, and fitted it with stalls of cedar wood; but fuller restoration and enrichment were required in order to bring back its original grace and beauty, and to make it helpful to purposes of devotion. This duty, as well as the general renewal of the Palace, was entrusted to the well-known architect, Mr. Butterfield. Mr. Butterfield's work always arrested attention and provoked criticism. His restoration of the Exeter Palace Chapel was no exception to the rule. To some the colouring seems crude, and the whole restoration to have been carried out with little sympathy for the past history of the building; to others, and especially Bishop Temple, the result appeared a complete success. The restored Palace and Chapel were to him always a great delight. Between the Bishop and the architect there was a good deal of fellow-feeling, born of common aims and characteristics.¹ Both had the same indifference to the conventional, and the same love of what was simple and direct. The Bishop cared but little for the colours which were dear to the architect, but he greatly admired the boldness and dignity of his designs, and he recognised with kindred spirit both the reverence which pervaded the whole conception, and also the truthfulness which always ensured correspondence between estimated and actual cost. Moreover, Mr. Butterfield's reality and downrightness were much after his mind. It pleased him to recall how, when application was once made to the architect to build a racquet court at Rugby, and there was some doubt as to whether so great an artist would lend his art

¹ Mr. Butterfield, by the Bishop's suggestion, was, also employed as the architect of the new buildings in connexion with the Exeter Grammar School.

to so homely a purpose, the reply was, "I will build a pig-sty if it has got to be built." The inscription placed on the south-west wall of the Chapel tells the tale of the restoration in plain words which suit the spirit in which it was executed.

INSCRIPTION IN PALACE CHAPEL

The eastern end of this Chapel was built in the early part of the thirteenth century; the western was an ante-room of later date. The wall between these has now been removed and the present screen and stalls erected where it stood. A passage to the Cathedral has been cut off from the western end. The east wall and its three fine windows, which were ruinous when the Bishop took possession of the See, have been accurately rebuilt and all the sound stones have been replaced. The roof has been repaired, the floor renewed, the ancient ceiling, which had been concealed by plaster, has been uncovered, repaired, and painted. The Chapel has been entirely refurnished. The glass in the centre light of the eastern triplet is the gift of the Lady Caroline Lascelles, that in the lights on either side, of her daughters Mary Louisa Lascelles and Beatrice Blanche Temple. The glass in the northern and southern windows is the gift of the Archdeacon of Exeter and eight of the Prebendaries of the Cathedral.

This work was done under the direction of William Butterfield in the Episcopate of Frederick Temple in the years 1878-79.

The furniture of the Chapel was afterwards enriched by a gift of communion vessels from chaplains and some of those who received ordination at the Bishop's hands.

The new home, exclusive of the Chapel, was ready for the Bishop and his family in the summer of 1870, about six months after his consecration. He brought into it the two daughters of his brother, Colonel Temple (the "Johnnie" of Blundell days), and his chaplain. His sister Jennetta took her place, as at Rugby, at the head of the household. In a book which the Bishop once gave his sister, he

styles himself her "admiring brother." The epithet was well chosen. Miss Temple was no ordinary woman. It was necessary to know her well before she could be appreciated, but she was worth knowing. Like her brother in many things, it could not be said that she was modelled on him; she was herself and no one else—perhaps co-ordinate with him, but not subordinate either to him or any one. But the similarity between the two was striking. She had all, and more than all, of his outspoken speech and directness of action. Dr. Benson used to give, with much amusement, a striking instance. Once in early days he came somewhat late for an appointment with his chief at Rugby. "Benson, you have kept me waiting," was the greeting. "Yes, I must apologise, but I have had a tooth out." "Oh, poor fellow, I am sorry." "Don't waste pity on me, Dr. Temple, I took gas." (In astonishment)—"What did you take gas for?" "Because it hurt." "Hurt! of course it hurt." And so they went to business. After it was over the young master went to pay his respects to the sister. "Oh, do you know you kept my brother waiting, Mr. Benson?" "Yes, I was so sorry, but I waited to have a tooth out." "Oh, how I pity you." "You needn't pity me, Miss Temple, I took gas." "What did you take gas for?" "Because it hurt." "Hurt! of course it hurt."

Here is another case which she recalled herself. In Oxford days a friend of Tractarian sympathies came to luncheon during Lent. She knew that he spoke strongly about the duty of fasting at that season, and she felt that she must order her table accordingly. She thought that she was only doing what was right by him, but somehow he did not like it. She judged him by herself, but it is not every one who likes being taken at his word. The directness was not always liked, but it

had a wonderful way of always carrying its point. Once she was shopping in Torquay, and on returning to the carriage she found that her purse was gone. Putting two and two together, she felt that the cabman was the culprit. "Drive me to the Police Station," she said at once. He drove her, and the missing purse was found on his person. "To think of a man driving himself where he was sure to be caught," was the jeer of the fellow-cabmen; but in like circumstances they would have done the same if they had had to face that straight look and determined will. These prevailed with churchwarden no less than cabman. It was not always easy to gain an entrance into parishes for the new Bishop in the first days of suspicion and hesitation. Here is an instance of directness and sisterly devotion helping each other to the desired end. "Soon," says Mr. Carlyon, "after the Bishop came to reside at Nansladron,¹ I was in my garden, and saw the Bishop's carriage arriving with a lady alone in it. On my approaching, 'Are you Mr. Carlyon,' she asked, 'the churchwarden?' 'Yes.' 'I want you to do me a favour. I am the Bishop's sister, and very anxious that your Vicar should ask him to preach. The Bishop's chaplain has already asked him, but the reply is that the services are already provided for, and that the Vicar will not trouble the Bishop. The Chaplain has just come back. What a muddle! I am very anxious that my brother should preach in S. Austell Church, but he must be asked. Can *you* see the Vicar and set it right?' 'Certainly, I will do my best; but I am just going out to dine at a house seven miles off; I could see the Vicar to-morrow morning.' On being asked how much time I could at once spare," continues Mr. Carlyon, "and suggesting some few minutes only, Miss Temple rushed the

¹ See *supra*, p. 382.

situation and said, 'Jump into my carriage; I will take you down to the Vicarage and back again.' An interview of two or three minutes with the Vicar, whom I found ill in bed, sufficed, and on the following Sunday the pulpit was occupied by the new Bishop, to the satisfaction, not only of his sister, but of a large congregation."

But with all her force of character Miss Temple did not stretch herself "beyond her measure." Supreme in the household, she had the good sense and womanly feeling to make no attempt to rule the diocese. Being keenly interested in the success of her brother's educational policy, she accepted a seat on the School Board of S. Thomas' (Exeter), and threw herself heartily into the work.¹ She also discharged all the social duties of her position with kindly conscientiousness; but her first care was to make a home for her brother, so that he might be free and happy in his labours. In and for her brother she lived from first to last, and the affection was reciprocated. Next to his mother his sister "Netta" is his chief home correspondent in the early days. The expression, "You have Mamma and Netta," quoted in the previous chapter from his school letters,² speaks volumes. She was his confidant in all matters great and small at each successive stage in his long life.

One letter from the sister will suffice to illustrate the devotion:—

October 19, 1869.

MY DEAR DR. BENSON—I must thank you with all my heart for your 'brave, loving letter.'³

¹ The book of prayers and hymns which, with the help of one or two others, she compiled for the schools is still in daily use. "Miss Temple gave me my first lessons in School Board work," says a leading member (Mr. John Stocker) of the present Exeter Local Authority, "and she it was who first made me feel the nobility and dignity of Education."² *Supra*, p. 476.

³ His published letter in the *Times* at the time of the Exeter appointment. *Supra*, p. 287.

All the storm has pained me so much—it is so unlike what I should desire for him. These two months, when his own prayers and the prayers of those who care for him or the Church should have been invited, to be broken in upon by such discòrdant outcries has been very sad to me. God bless you for loving him, for praying for him, as I know you will do.

This earnest and affectionate nature applied itself strenuously to all the routine of the Exeter home life. Her view of the kind of establishment which a bishop should maintain was an unconscious reproduction of John Wesley's idea as given above.¹ "I want the clergy very often to come into meals," she once said to a friend, "but when they come, not to find things altogether unlike what they have at home"; and so her aim was "sufficiency," but not "redundance," a fare "plain and good, but not delicate," as Wesley said. She was the most loyal, not of sisters only, but of friends. There was nothing she would not do for them; only she liked to do it in her own way, and give them what she thought good for them. She understood the welfare of others better than she understood their self-development. On these principles she made the Bishop's home and administered his household: a good, strong, loving woman, always looking at the 'very heart of things,' incapable of doing, or indeed of comprehending, anything mean or small, judging life not by conventional standards, but by the laws of right and wrong, which to her were always plain; one whose company braced like a tonic, and from whom her friends parted with a sense that a higher view of life and duty had been gained in her presence. After three years at Exeter her health, which had never been vigorous, began to fail; she was forced reluctantly to leave her brother's home, and to reside

¹ *Supra*, p. 509.

wherever the conditions of climate were found most favourable. For the last seventeen years of her life her self-reliant nature underwent the discipline of illness. Still eager for an active life, she was compelled to sit apart and to watch and wait. She gave herself to her life of sickness with the same set purpose with which she had faced the life of activity. At Clifton, Cannes, and elsewhere she drew as friends around her those who could appreciate an uncommon character. To the last she retained her keen interest in the public movements of the day, bringing to bear on them open eyes and strong, pungent common sense; to the last she lighted up character and circumstance with the play of her kindly humour; to the last her devotion to her brother was the ruling passion. She died at Tunbridge Wells, August 16, 1890, and was buried there in the presence of her brother, Mrs. Temple, and relations, and of one friend, Ernest Sandford, who owed her much.¹ This is the estimate formed of her by one who had known her long and read character well:—

BALLIOL COLLEGE, *August 19, 1890.*

MY DEAR BISHOP—I am deeply grieved to hear of your sister's death. I think that she was one of the best women whom I ever knew. She never thought of herself, and was so capable and self-sacrificing and did so much good in such a sensible manner. Your life was her joy and pride; and to a nature like this it was a real happiness to know that she had left you with one who could do more for you than she could in the late years of life. I remember her as far back as the year 1843. Many things which she said to me have become impressed on my mind—one in particular which occurs to me while writing, "That persons who wanted to do good must efface themselves." I was very glad to have renewed acquaintance and friendship with her last summer. I was greatly

¹ The Rev. Percy Smith, Chaplain of Christ Church, Cannes, took part in the service.

struck by her clearness of mind and resignation to her great trial.

With most kind regards to Mrs. Temple, yours truly
and affectionately, B. JOWETT.

An elder sister, Mrs. Thorold,¹ who lived at Plymouth, and gave a welcome there to the Bishop and his chaplain during frequent visits, died and was buried at Exeter in the autumn of the year 1872.

In the early days of her illness Miss Temple had been made anxious by the thought that her brother was left in solitude at Exeter, and she wrote to a friend suggesting the possibility of a new chaplain, to supply in some measure her place; but the Bishop found for himself a more excellent way.

THE PALACE, EXETER.

MY DEAR DR. BENSON—I daresay the Bishop will write himself, but I write to ask you and Mrs. Benson to share my joy in his happiness, for he is engaged to be married to Beatrice Lascelles, and is very happy. I saw her once and liked her very much; she is a true, sweet woman with a most pleasant voice and charming, simple manners. He has so lived for others all his life that to see him at last with happiness for himself fills one with thankfulness. I was in any case to have gone abroad for the winter, and was preparing with a most sore heart to leave him, with all his hard work, alone in this great house; now it is all well, for even my illness makes it on one side more perfect for him, as he has not even the passing regret that I had to leave my old home. He does look so happy—his eyes shine like stars. God bless them both. I have been to Vichy and am better. Love to you both.—Yours affectionately,

J. O. TEMPLE.

August 2.

On August 24, 1876, he was married in S. Michael's Church, Chester Square, London, to Beatrice Blanche Lascelles, fifth daughter of the Right Honourable William Sebright and Lady Caroline Lascelles. The peals which rang out on the marriage day from the tower of Exeter Cathedral

¹ "Earlier Years" Memoir, p. 16.

were an omen of the happy years which followed, and in that happiness both the western diocese and the whole Church of England may be said to have had their share. The debt which both owe to Mrs. Temple is very large. To her the vigorous and prolonged service of the twenty-six years which succeeded the marriage is mainly due. When men looked at the cheerful face and unabated force of Dr. Temple in old age, and rejoiced in the sense of security which his rule of the English Church inspired, they instinctively thought of Mrs. Temple; they knew that she made his life, and lightened the burden of the "care of all the churches." She did not intensify the characteristics of the strong personality, but she supplemented and interpreted them. No one fully read Dr. Temple until they had seen him with his wife and boys. A new brightness came into the home at Exeter; the boy nature in him awoke and helped to keep him young. "A wonderful wife and two perfect boys," he wrote to his old friend, Canon Saltren Rogers.¹ Both the sons were born at Exeter, Frederick Charles, June 25, 1879, and William, October 15, 1881. Both were baptized after the second lesson at Evensong on Sunday in Exeter Cathedral. To play with them as children, to take long walks with them and inspire them with his own love of the country, as they grew older, to be in their company, to poke fun at them, was a daily joy. No home life was freer or more happy; it was good to see. There was teaching and training, and the Bishop was never so busy that he could not make time to answer a question or solve a problem, or give regular preparation at solemn times. But for the most part, that which opened mind and developed character was the unconscious training of growing fellowship with the father. Constant and almost

¹ See *supra*, p. 465.

daily letters passed during time of absence, and through correspondence and intercourse the things learnt became part of the learner. The father's thoughts and aims passed into the sons.¹

Mrs. Temple's influence at Exeter soon made itself felt. It was not only that she made the home at Exeter, but she extended it. Many new activities were set on foot, and into them all something of home atmosphere began to penetrate. The word to express her own part in them would not be management, but sympathy and fellowship. It may be that Dr. Temple conceived of a diocese as a hive rather than as a home, but Mrs. Temple did not a little to make it a home. The Bishop had gained not so much a champion, still less a joint administrator, as a good and gracious wife; and through her some of the corners were perhaps worn off, and at any rate the strong, great man was better understood; the character was translated into a language which had a softer sound in men's ears.

As soon as Dr. Temple had made the Palace habitable, he began to make himself at home in the Cathedral City. And naturally his first charge there was the Cathedral, the Mother Church of the diocese. For him the two conceptions of hive and home went together, and his aim was to make the Cathedral a home from which diocesan activities should emanate, with the inspiration of prayer and religious thought attaching to them. More than most cathedrals the Church of S. Peter at Exeter is bound up with the Exeter Episcopate. There is scarcely a foot of the sacred ground which does not call up the memory of one or other of the long line of bishops. The Cathedral, both in constitution and fabric, is their handiwork, and

¹ Editor's Supplement, vol. ii. p. 677.

theirs had been in the earlier days a dominant and prevailing influence. As far as there had been developments in later days they had been less Episcopal. It was not desirable to undo history, nor indeed, with the diminished revenues of modern times, was it possible for a bishop to repair or enlarge the fabric at his own charges ; but it was Dr. Temple's aim and duty to make the bishop's influence in the Cathedral a reality. At the Restoration of 1660 the first act of Dean (soon to be Bishop) Seth Ward had been the casting out "the buyers and sellers who had usurped the Cathedral, and therein kept, distinct shops to vend their wares."¹ He had then removed the "Babylonish Wall" of the Commonwealth which had portioned off the building into two compartments, called respectively East Peter's and West Peter's. Afterwards he repaired and beautified the Cathedral at a cost of £25,000, and bought a "new pair of organs" (John Loosemoore's organ), esteemed the best in England, which cost another £2000.² Since that time Grandisson's great west window had been newly glazed under the direction of Mr. Peckett (1760), and a new reredos had been erected.³ But with these exceptions and a good deal of occasional cleansing, colouring, and touching up, little had been done ; and the work, such as it was (including both reredos and glazing of the west window), was more true to eighteenth-century ideas than to earlier and better days of ecclesiastical art. To the Dean and Chapter of Bishop Temple's Episcopate belongs the credit of restoring the building to much of its original beauty, and adapting it, under the altered conditions of modern times, to enlarged uses worthy of a cathedral. With wise providence they had accumulated out

¹ Oliver, p. 152.² *Ibid.* p. 153.³ *Infra*, p. 526.

of the capitular revenues a large sum for this purpose; they added great donations from their own private resources; and, taking advantage of the impulse given to Church effort by the coming of a new bishop, eager for work and enterprise, they entered (1872) upon the great undertaking of a full and worthy restoration. The choice of the late Sir Gilbert Scott as architect was a guarantee for careful treatment on conservative lines. With the evidence thus given of thought and liberality, the Capitular Body soon had the city and county and the whole diocese at their back.

The Bishop threw himself with characteristic energy into a congenial work. He was a foremost spokesman of the committee at a series of meetings organised in different centres, and he knew well how to evoke the feelings natural to each place where he spoke. In the Guildhall of Exeter, February 1872, his theme was local sentiment:—

. . . There were other cathedrals which might claim to have more grace in their beauty, but there was none, it seemed to him, that possessed more quiet dignity, more of that majesty that spoke so directly to the soul and left a permanent impression on the memory. And all the more did he value it because the beauty that specially distinguished it was a beauty that belonged to this part of England, for it seemed as if the cathedral represented, in the most perfect form, the architecture of Devon and Cornwall; and somehow he could not help feeling about the very defects just as a man very often felt about some slight fault or blemish that other people might see in those he loved, as if they were but fresh reasons for attraction—that even such things as seemed blemishes to others were something that awoke his love, something that spoke to him of his home.¹

In the hall of Exeter College at Oxford, November 4, 1872, Dr. Temple's appeal is chiefly to the religious and historic sense:—

¹ *Exeter and Plymouth Gazette*, February 9, 1872.

It ought not to be very difficult to interest the University of Oxford in such a work as this. Here they were not all absorbed in the interest of the moment; here, surely, if anywhere, men would take a deep interest in their past history, and in the monuments of that history, and would feel a great desire to maintain the beauty of the old works of art. They would, he thought, feel a still deeper interest in those monuments of history and of art which belonged to the Church of England, and which spoke to them of the enduring character of that faith by which we all lived. . . . Exeter Cathedral had one special claim upon some of the colleges at Oxford. The college in which they were assembled owed its original foundation to an Exeter Bishop of great fame in history;¹ and this was not the only college that must feel an interest in Exeter. Others owed something in various ways to the liberality of Cornish and Devon benefactors. They appealed, for instance, to Corpus Christi College, because, as every one knew, it was a Bishop of Exeter² that induced the founder of that college to spend his money upon a college in Oxford, instead of establishing an additional monastery. He almost felt also that there was a tie between Balliol College and Devonshire, because a Devonshire scholarship was attached to that college. Such ties as these, and there were many more that he could enumerate, were surely reasons why Oxford men should do their part in assisting to restore the great cathedral of the west.³

The work of restoration cost £50,000. This sum was augmented by special offerings connected with incidents and names of which Devon has reason to be proud—notably the pulpit in the nave, commemorating the martyrdom of John Coleridge Pattison, first Bishop of Melanesia. Amongst many great gifts the donation of Lady Rolle, who presented the greater part of the fittings of the Lady Chapel at her sole cost, stands out prominent. In the chapter, Chancellor Harington was the chief contributor, giving more than £4000, and Archdeacon Freeman was the graphic historian. Dean Boyd was chief promoter and champion, and

¹ Stapeldon.

² Hugh Oldham.

³ *Exeter and Plymouth Gazette*, November 8, 1872.

everywhere made his ascendancy felt. The whole restoration was seven years in progress. It was taken in two periods, the first being devoted to the more elaborate work required for the restoration of the choir, and the latter being occupied with renewal and refitting in the nave. The boarding erected in order to screen off the portion of the Cathedral at the time under restoration from that part required for service was a harmless and temporary rebuilding of the "Babylonish Wall." This is no place for detailed account of all that was done. Structural alteration was confined to the piercing of the screen, attributed to Bishop Stapeldon, which divides the choir from the nave. The main work was to remove certain "encroaching pews and Georgian pannelling," and to cleanse the great piers from the yellow wash with which they had been covered in later days, and thus to enable the building to speak for itself. It only remained to bring back some trace of the original colouring to the chapels and vaulted roof of the choir, and to enrich the building with costly new furniture in the shape of marble pavements and carved oaken stalls and stained windows, of which last it had been well-nigh denuded by the stern hand of the Puritan.

A great diocesan gathering on S. Luke's day 1877 celebrated the completion of the restoration. It was the first of many like functions; they have demonstrated the purposes for which the fabric of the Mother Church was restored, and they have justified the work. The dedication services were continued for two days, and the preachers were Bishops Harold Browne, Moberly, Mackarness, and Lord Arthur Hervey. These had been chosen either for their past connexion with the diocese, or on account of the contiguity of the sees which they held. Their words made a mark at the time, and now that, with the presiding prelate himself

and all the members of the then chapter, the four bishops have passed within the veil, they will always be associated with this day of abiding memories.

Bishop Temple's own voice was often heard in the pulpit of his restored cathedral, and it was there that he first became known as a preacher of sermons to the people. These sermons, strangely unlike the crisp, condensed, and forceful addresses in Rugby School Chapel, had nevertheless a nobility of their own. The sympathy of a strong man in deadly earnest pouring out his heart to his fellow-men attracted by the reality of every word. The hearers became conscious that they were the better for what they heard. From the day of the reopening, Exeter Cathedral has become increasingly the home of the people at large, and the utterances of Bishop Temple will always fit in with the truest messages of after days; in his direct and simple words on essential truths and duties he gave the type on which appeals to a great congregation of people may best be modelled.

The aims and permanent results of the restoration of the Cathedral have been indicated. During its progress an incident occurred which, while it lasted, was sufficiently unpleasant, and threatened for a while to make shipwreck of the undertaking. Among the new fittings designed by Sir Gilbert Scott for the restored building was a reredos destined to take the place of the specimen of eighteenth-century work referred to above,¹ which was itself a substitution for an older altar-piece, spoken of by a historian of Exeter as a "grand performance in painting."² The "performance" represented apparently an imaginary duplicate cathedral, and included portraits of Moses and Aaron

¹ *Supra*, p. 522.

² *History of Exeter*, compiled from Hooker, 1765. Referred to in Freeman's *History of Exeter Cathedral*, p. 95.

supporting the tables of the Decalogue. It was probably introduced as part of Seth Ward's work of restoration after the Puritan epoch. Its immediate successor dates from 1817, and was designed by Mr. John Kendal, a stone-mason, acting under the Cathedral surveyor; it was a simple slab inscribed with the Ten Commandments and surmounted by some canopy work. When this later reredos in its turn gave place to Sir Gilbert Scott's design, the tables of the Decalogue were removed to the retro-choir, where they now hang. The present reredos is the joint gift of Chancellor Harington and Dr. Blackall,¹ the latter being a well-known citizen of Exeter and a lineal descendant of Bishop Ofspring Blackall. The material is alabaster and marble, studded with costly stones. The subject of the central panel is the Ascension, our Lord being represented in the act of blessing as He rises from the earth. In the two other panels are depicted the Transfiguration and the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost. The whole is crowned by a cross with angels standing on either hand. There is neither crucifix nor Calvary group, and doctrinally the reredos had no controversial significance. From an artistic point of view, while the structure is graceful it may be held to be slightly mechanical; and had it been erected now, something bolder and ampler might possibly have been suggested—a design which would more naturally have carried back thought to the silver altar of Bishop Stapeldon, reputed to be the costliest in the world,¹ with its canopied reredos, "rich with statuary, colouring, and gold."² But the artist of the nineteenth century had restraining limitations to consider; the design expressed the high-water mark of general Anglican feeling on such subjects at the time, and

¹ Freeman's *History of Exeter Cathedral*, p. 46.

² *Ibid.* p. 60.

it commends itself by its combination of moderation and good taste to the main body and sober mind, if it does not fully satisfy artistic requirement.

Unobjectionable as it was, it did not pass unchallenged. Archdeacon Phillpotts, Chancellor of the Diocese, son of the late Bishop, lodged complaint against it on the ground of illegality. It was not that the Archdeacon was quick, from the Protestant standpoint, to scent out danger; but he inherited something of his father's liking for legal points. Perhaps also he recalled the days when his father, averse to all novelties, and champion of the old, and not the modern, High Church cause, had swept off intruding flower-pots from the altar of a Torquay church. Moreover, the Chancellor had had previous trouble with a reredos in the parish church of Lynton, and having ordered the removal of certain figures thereon may have conceived that it was his duty to make his protest on the present occasion.¹ Anyhow, he presented a petition to the Bishop, praying him to exercise his power as Visitor of the Cathedral and inquire into the legality of the reredos, both in itself and also as having been erected without the consent of the Bishop. Dr. Temple had no sympathy with the Archdeacon's line, but the complainant was his Chancellor; the Public Worship Regulation Act had not as yet been passed,² giving the Episcopal veto, when his Chancellor presented his petition; and his own record and lifelong view were in favour of leaving the settlement in such cases to the law, as ultimately the surest security for liberty. He had a very strong personal repugnance to anything that might create friction between

¹ Report of the Exeter Reredos Case, preserved by the Chapter Clerk, p. 67.

² This Act was passed August 7, 1874, and came into operation July 1, 1875.

himself and the Chapter, but for him personal considerations could not enter in a matter of this kind ; and on full review he concluded that he had no option, and that the case must go forward. His sole aim was to hold the scale of the balance even ; and when the Privy Council had ruled that there was nothing illegal in the figures on the Exeter reredos, and shortly afterwards the legislature granted an Episcopal veto, he was well satisfied to exercise it in the case of the reredos in S. Paul's, and to base his action on the decision which had been previously given by the Court of Appeal in the parallel instance at Exeter.

The following were the different stages in the Exeter case :—

(1) The Bishop having decided to receive the Chancellor's petition, and having obtained, through application to the Lord Chancellor, the assistance of Mr. Justice Keating as assessor, cited the Dean and Chapter nominatim to appear before him in the Chapter-house of the Cathedral on January 7, 1874. Mr. W. F. Phillpotts was present as Counsel for his father, the petitioner ; Dr. Deane, Q.C., and Mr. Walter Phillimore represented the Dean and Chapter ; Mr. A. Sturtees was solicitor on the side of the petitioner, and Messrs. Force and Battishill acted in that capacity for the respondents. At the close of a three days' crowded session the court was adjourned, to meet again in the Chapter-house on April 15 following, when the Bishop first read the opinion of his assessor. It upheld the Bishop's jurisdiction, and maintained the illegality of the figures both in themselves, and also on the ground that the reredos had been erected without a faculty.

The Bishop then delivered his judgment, in accordance with the opinion, in the following terms :—

Having now read the opinion of my learned Assessor in which the law affecting the questions before me is so ably and so clearly stated, it remains only for me to say that I assent to and adopt that opinion, and to pronounce judgment in conformity therewith.

Accordingly, I, as Visitor and Ordinary, do declare and adjudge that the removal of the Stone Screen which recently formed the East End of the Choir of this our Cathedral Church with the Ten Commandments thereupon, and the setting up of a Reredos with certain Images thereon in substitution of the said Screen so removed by the Dean and Canons, being the Respondents herein, without any faculty or other lawful authority, was illegal as contrary to the Laws Ecclesiastical. And I do further declare and adjudge that the Images upon the said Reredos so set up, and the placing and continuing of the same by the Respondents upon the said Reredos, are and is illegal, as contrary to the Laws Ecclesiastical. And I do order and adjudge that the said Reredos and the Images thereon be removed, and that either a Stone Screen without Images thereon be erected, or the open ironwork lately erected and now standing on each side of the said Reredos be continued, so as to occupy its place. And I do further order and adjudge that the Ten Commandments be set up on the East End of the Choir of our said Cathedral, in compliance with the terms of the Canon, where the people may best see and read the same.

Having now, in accordance with the advice of my learned Assessor, pronounced a formal Judgment so as to found a right of appeal, if any of the parties should be so advised, I think it right to add that I shall be quite ready to entertain an application for a Faculty to vary the above order and to make such arrangements as, without involving anything illegal, would contribute to the Architectural beauty of the Cathedral, and I may observe that the position of the Petitioner as Chancellor will offer no obstacle, as I should myself hear the application according to the reservation contained in his patent.

I may state that if there is no appeal it will be competent for the Petitioner, if the Reredos be not removed or a Faculty granted, to apply to me within a reasonable time for a monition to enforce the order, giving, of course, the usual notice.¹

¹ Report of Exeter Reredos Case, preserved by the Chapter Clerk, pp. 177, 178.

(2) Against this decision the Dean and Chapter appealed to the Court of Arches. In a private letter written to his Chaplain the Bishop makes it evident that this appeal was much to his mind :—

THE VICARAGE, WEST ALVINGTON,
KINGSBRIDGE, *April 21, 1874.*

MY DEAR SANDFORD—. . . I am very sorry about the Reredos business. From what was said in London by other lawyers I had hoped that Keating would not have condemned the whole, but only the central figure. And this would have made the whole matter much easier to deal with.

As it is, I wish very much that they would appeal. I cannot, I fear, rightly enter into the matter with them myself. After all, my position is judicial, and if I am to confer, I ought to confer with both parties and not with only one of the two. But I would gladly give a good deal and do a good deal to get the Chapter out of all trouble in the case.

But it seems to me that to appeal is the only course open.
—Yours affectionately, F. EXON.

The Dean of Arches reversed the judgment given at Exeter. (a) He held that although the Bishop had a general jurisdiction as Visitor of the Cathedral, it was doubtful how far it extended to the ornaments and fabric thereof. (b) In regard to the question of the necessity for a faculty, his words were these:—"A careful consideration of the whole of this question, with reference both to principle and to practice, leads me to a clear conclusion that the absence of an Episcopal faculty does not render the erection of this reredos illegal." (c) In regard to the illegality of the figures in themselves he states:—"I do not think that in the Cathedral of Exeter the reredos put up by the Dean and Chapter can be justly said, to borrow the words of our 30th Canon, 'to endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men.'"¹

(3) The Archdeacon in turn appealed to the

¹ See Report as above.

Privy Council, who reversed the judgment of the Court of Arches in so far as it limited the Bishop's visitatorial jurisdiction over the Cathedral, but maintained the judgment on the two points of the non-requirement of the faculty and the legality of the figures. The following are the parts of the judgment which bear upon these three particulars :—

(a) Their Lordships are, under these circumstances, unable to agree with the opinion expressed by the learned Dean of Arches against the jurisdiction of the Bishop in the present case. . . . (b) No authority has been cited, and no instance has been produced, in which a grant of any such faculty has been applied for, either in the case of Exeter Cathedral or of any other Cathedral, although it is notorious that important alterations in the fabric of most Cathedrals have continually been effected. . . . (c) What, then, is the character of the sculpture on the reredos in the case before their Lordships? For what purpose has it been set up? To what end is it used? and is it in danger of being abused? It is a sculptured work in high relief, in which are three compartments. That in the centre represents the ascension of our Lord, in which the figure of our ascending Lord is separated by a sort of border from the figures of the Apostles, who are gazing upward. The right compartment represents the Transfiguration, and the left the Descent of the Holy Ghost on the Day of Pentecost. The representations appear to be similar to those with which every one is familiar in regard to the sacred subjects in question. All the figures are delineated as forming part of the connected representation of the historical subject. The ascension necessarily represents our Lord as separated from the Apostles, who are gazing at Him on His ascent. As finials to the architectural form of the reredos, there is on each side a separate figure of an angel. It is plain to their Lordships that the whole erection has been set up for the purpose of decoration only.

It is not suggested that any superstitious reverence has been, or is likely to be, paid to any figures forming part of the reredos, and their Lordships are unable to discover anything which distinguishes this representation from the numerous sculptured and painted representations of portions

of the sacred history to be found in many of our cathedrals and parish churches; and which have been proved, by long experience, to be capable of remaining there without giving occasion to any idolatrous or superstitious practices. Their Lordships are of opinion that such a decorative work would be lawful in any other part of the church; and, if so, they are not aware of any contravention of the Laws Ecclesiastical by reason of its erection in the particular place which it now occupies. . . .

Their Lordships desire it to be clearly understood that nothing decided in this case affects the question of superstitious regard being paid, contrary to the XXIInd Article of Religion, to any representations or images that are, or may at any time be, set up in churches. The law will at all times be sufficiently strong to correct and control any such abuse; but their Lordships are of opinion that the sculpture in question is not liable to be impugned in that respect. Their Lordships will therefore recommend Her Majesty to reverse the decree pronounced by the Dean of Arches, so far as it reversed the decree of the Lord Bishop of Exeter in pronouncing for his jurisdiction as Visitor and Ordinary of the Cathedral Church of S. Peter, in Exeter, but to affirm the decree of the Dean of Arches in all other respects.¹ . . .

The reredos still stands in the sacarium of Exeter Cathedral. There was a strange inversion of parts connected with its erection, and it is possible for those who look at it to indulge in irony:—"This is a piece of imagery which was put up by a Protestant Dean and denounced by the son of a High Church Bishop; the ultimate result of the attempt to expel it was to give sanction and impulse to uses against which the *petitioner* protested, and to confirm that Episcopal jurisdiction in the Cathedral against which the *respondents* protested; the concession made to the High Churchman was ultimately granted by a court which he abhors; a Bishop decreed the removal of the reredos, but it still stands in open defiance within view from the Episcopal throne." But another way of looking

¹ Judgment of the Privy Council, delivered February 25, 1875.

at what happened is to reflect with satisfaction that in the long-run the moderate settlement is brought about, and that what is in itself indifferent does not permanently stand as a barrier between sensible men. Bishops and Cathedral authorities at Exeter never now give a thought to what but for a little wise discretion on both sides might have become a perpetual bone of contention ; and simple Christian people visiting the place "lift up their hearts" as they gaze at the reredos, all unconscious of the wordy strife which once raged over it in the Chapter-house hard by. This, perhaps, is the truer view.

The Bishop's desire in regard to the Cathedral was twofold—(1) to widen its influence as a centre of worship and home of thought ; (2) to bring it into closer contact with the Diocese for purposes of executive action. To his mind the aims were inseparable ; but not so in the view of the Chapter ; and while this great work of restoration was a manifest token that they went with him in his desire to draw the Diocese to the Cathedral as the centre of its worship, they had little mind to take the Cathedral out into the Diocese for purposes of work. Most of them were old and stay-at-home ; he was comparatively young, and vigorous exceedingly ; they were students or preachers ; he was a man of action, and though he had studied much, he was not a student of the cloister. Thus he was not in sympathy with their point of view, and was perhaps too much inclined to connect the stay-at-home attitude with distaste for work. An amusing incident in illustration, something of this kind, comes to mind. The Bishop, having swallowed a scanty luncheon, is off to a public meeting, pursued by his chaplain. Meeting a Canon of the Cathedral walking leisurely and with dignity through the Close, he interjects, almost without stopping : "Oh, Cook, I thought you would like to know that

there was no time to discuss the Cathedral question at the Bishops' meeting last week." "Was there not? I do not think there is much to discuss, except that I believe that the Bishops want the capitular revenues to pay their suffragans with." "Oh, I don't know about that; but there was a general opinion that they ought to do more *work*. Good morning." And so each went his own way, one towards the city, and the other in the direction of the Cathedral. About the same time—the early days of his Episcopate—after a meeting with the Chapter, he confided to his Chaplain, "I wish I found it easier to get on with the old men—I can manage the young ones well enough; but I was suggesting to the Chapter some diocesan work, and what do you think one of them said?—'My Lord, my conception of my duty is to keep my residence, to preach in my turn, and to attend Chapter. I don't see that there is any call upon me to undertake external duties besides this.' How am I to get them to work? And yet they are so good."

But worship and study were work nevertheless. It is much to the credit of both sides that with these essentially different views they got on so well together, especially considering that sometimes the delicate question of a bishop's special relations to a cathedral intervened, complicated in the case of Exeter by the fact that Bishop Phillpotts had himself been a member of the Chapter, and held the offices of Canon and Treasurer to the end of his life. In such cases the Bishop's old friend, Archdeacon Sanders, himself one of the Canons, was often a go-between. The following resolutions have regard to the question of the Bishop's right to attend the weekly meetings of the Chapter; the question arose out of misunderstanding on the Bishop's part of some words spoken by a member

of the Chapter at the Diocesan Conference, which were taken to imply that right :—

Resolutions adopted by the Chapter at their meeting on November 13, 1880 :—

1. That we fully recognise the right of the Bishop, as Visitor, to visit the Chapter when and as often as he pleases, and are prepared to respond to his Citations for that purpose with all due respect and obedience.

2. That we are unable to find that the Bishop, not being a Canon, has ever attended any of the ordinary or special meetings of the Chapter, and are unwilling to introduce a practice unsanctioned by law, statute, or precedent.

3. That it is the anxious desire of this Chapter to act in concert with the Bishop in all things which he may consider likely to promote the interests of religion and the welfare of the Diocese, and trust that the cordial relations hitherto existing between the Bishop and ourselves may remain undisturbed.

Here are two letters relating to the right of the diocese to express an opinion about Cathedral reform :—

THE PALACE, EXETER,
October 25, 1879.

MY DEAR ARCHDEACON—I send you a copy of a resolution¹ passed by the Ely Diocesan Conference at its meeting in June.

But that the Exeter Diocesan Conference should do the same thing is monstrous.—Yours ever, F. EXON.

THE PALACE, EXETER,
October 26, 1879.

MY DEAR ARCHDEACON—I send you what I promised. I have little doubt that some other suggestions would be made by the clergy. . . .—Yours ever, F. EXON.

¹ “That in view of the Royal Commission which the Premier has announced that he will recommend to the Crown, to inquire into the Cathedral Foundations, a Committee be appointed to report to the next Conference upon the relations of Ely Cathedral to the Diocese, and to offer such practical suggestions upon this subject as shall appear desirable.”

Agreed to unanimously by the Diocesan Conference of Ely, June 17, 1879.

P.S.—You note has just come in. I am much amused at your funny jealousy of the Conference. What other organ does the Diocese possess? You cannot seriously mean that the Diocese is to open its mouth and shut its eyes and see what their High Mightinesses the Chapter would give them. The Conference did quite right; if no one had moved for a Committee I should have suggested one.

Do not show the paper I send, but come and talk about it to-morrow evening. Come to dinner at 7.30 if you can, and we will talk it over alone.

The postscript of the last letter shows that the Bishop fully understood the way to win his old master. The Archdeacon might say that the dinners were “all gobble-and-go,” but he liked to come all the same, and in a friendly, social chat afterwards many a friendly diocesan treaty was signed between the two.

It is evident that the fuel was ready, but neither side wished to light the fire. With all his plainness of speech the Bishop was never ruffled, and thoroughly respected the learning and worth of his Chapter, while they had an equal belief in their Bishop's sincerity and singleness of aim.

The main issue—the participation of the Chapter in the executive work of the diocese—was raised as the result of the appointment in 1879 of a Royal Commission to inquire into the condition of cathedrals. The general aim of the Commission is expressed in an opening paragraph of their final Report:—

We have regarded the Cathedral and the members of the Cathedral body with reference not merely to the city in which they exist, nor, on the other hand, merely to the Church at large, but also and perhaps chiefly to the interests of the Diocese of which the Cathedral is the Mother Church and the Dean the leading Presbyter; nor have we omitted to recognise the importance of endeavouring to promote earnest and harmonious co-operation between the Bishop of the Diocese and the Cathedral body.

We have endeavoured to define and establish the relation in which the Bishop stands to the Cathedral, and have made provision for assuring to him his legitimate position and influence; and we have made recommendations which, as we believe, will have the effect of making the Cathedral body more helpful to the Bishop in the work of the Diocese than has usually been the case in recent times.¹

The Commission issued this Final Report in 1885; but previously to that date two general reports had been issued, together with a separate report on each cathedral, including Exeter. Inquiries had been addressed, as a preparatory measure, to all the Cathedral authorities. It was natural that while such projects were in the air, the question should be brought before the Diocesan Conference. This was done in 1879, when the following resolution, moved by the Rev. H. Tudor (now Sub-Dean of the Cathedral), was carried:—“That a Royal Commission having been appointed to inquire into Cathedral Foundations, a Committee of Clergy and Laity, members of this Conference, be named, to consider the relations of Exeter Cathedral to the Diocese, and to offer such practical suggestions to the Royal Commissioners, or to the Diocesan Conference, if time permits, as may seem to the Committee desirable.”² The Report was presented in the following year, when an animated debate took place, chiefly remarkable for an outspoken speech of the Dean, in which he “maintained that there were no relations between the diocese and the Cathedral, and thought it was a mistake to say that the Cathedral was the life and centre of the diocese.” “The changes proposed,” he said, “were of a most revolutionary character, and one of them would supersede the present Cathedral system, and convert its clergy into

¹ Final Report of Royal Commission on Cathedrals, 1885.

² Exeter Diocesan Conference Report, 1879.

diocesan officers.”¹ He created much amusement when closing his spirited oration by applying to the Diocesan Conference the rebuke administered to intruders of old—“Ye take too much upon you, ye sons of Levi.”

Ultimately the following resolutions were carried :—

I. That the number of Canons should be increased, and special duties over and above those at present required by law should be attached to some of them.

II. That one Canonry should be divided between three junior Canons, required to reside three months each, not forming part of the governing body, nor admitted to *plenum jus*, but eligible for advancement, and that those three Canons should be at the disposal of the Bishop for occasional charge of parishes and other spiritual work in the Diocese.

III. That the office of Chancellor should be attached to a Canonry, and that the duties of the Canon-Chancellor should be those which were originally imposed upon the Chancellor, with such additions as the circumstances of the Diocese or of the time may render desirable; for example, giving lectures on Theology, Ecclesiastical History, or Ecclesiastical Law, in the Cathedral or elsewhere.

IV. That the office of Precentor should be attached to one of the Canonries, and that the duties of the Canon-Precentor, assisted by a Succentor, should be to superintend, as the representative of the Chapter, the services of the Cathedral, and the training, education, and conduct of the Choir.

V. That the Archdeacons should be Canons in addition to the three present Canons, and should be required to reside three months in every year.

VI. That the Dean and Canons (other than the Archdeacons and the Junior Canons) should each of them reside for nine months in the year at the least, the time occupied by them in performing special duties elsewhere in the Diocese being counted as residence, and the time of residence being so arranged as that there should be always two Canons

¹ Exeter Diocesan Conference Report, 1880.

in residence at the same time. No exception to be made to the above rule of residence but by licence from the Bishop on the proposal of the Chapter.

VII. That except by Archdeacons no Livings be held by either Dean or Canons.

VIII. That in order to carry out the above recommendations, a readjustment should be made in future, as vacancies occur, in the divisible income of the Dean and Chapter, so that ultimately it should be applied annually as follows, viz. :—

| | | | |
|--|-------|---|---|
| The Dean to receive | £1600 | 0 | 0 |
| Three Canons, £800 each | 2400 | 0 | 0 |
| Three Junior Canons, £333 : 6 : 8 each | 1000 | 0 | 0 |
| Three Archdeacons, £333 : 6 : 8 each | 1000 | 0 | 0 |
| | £6000 | 0 | 0 |

IX. That the attention of the Royal Commissioners should be directed to the desirability of some liberal scheme of compulsory retirement, by which Deans, Canons, Archdeacons, and Priest Vicars may retire when unable from old age, long-continued illness, or other incapacity to perform their duties, unless those duties be discharged by a deputy approved by the Bishop.

X. That Prebendaries should be summoned to all elections in which they are to take part by letter instead of by a notice placed on the Precentor's Stall in the choir of the Cathedral, and that the equal right of the Prebendaries to represent the Cathedral body in Convocation should be considered and determined.¹

¹ To these Resolutions of the Diocesan Conference two clauses are annexed in the copy forwarded by the Bishop to the Commissioners :—

“The following recommendations were also made by the committee, but were withdrawn in consequence of a statement by the Chancellor of the Cathedral that the Bishop already had a right to summon the whole Cathedral body whenever he thought fit, and to attend the Chapter (that is, the governing Chapter) weekly, if he desired it.” (It appears that the Bishop was under a misapprehension in concluding that the Chapter recognised his right to attend the ordinary weekly meetings of the Chapter. See *supra*, p. 535.—Ed.)

“That the Bishop should have power to summon the whole Chapter (including non-residentiary as well as residentiary members) to meet in the Chapter House of the Cathedral for the purpose of consulting them as his council whenever he may desire their advice; and that this should be done not less frequently than once in each year. Such

The Bishop summed up the discussion with words of grateful acknowledgment to the Chapter :—

He thought that they ought not to allow the occasion to pass without taking the opportunity of publicly noticing the very great services which the Dean and Chapter had rendered. . . .¹ No body of men had discharged duties of patronage more faithfully, and to this must be added the munificence they had shown in the work of restoration, which would be long remembered with gratitude to their honour. For himself, in his relations with them, although they had not always agreed with his views, yet that was no more than might be expected from thinking men; but he had certainly found them exceedingly courteous and desirous to consider everything that he had put before them.¹

The Bishop, besides forwarding the resolutions to the Commissioners in accordance with the desire of the Conference, presented the following memorandum of his own :—

It appears to me that, in any alterations affecting the laws which govern the Cathedral, three aims ought to be kept in view :—

To improve the services.

To attach the Diocese to the Cathedral.

To render such services to the Diocese as the Cathedral body can best render.

1. For the improvement of the services the most important alterations appear to me to be the dissolution of the college of Vicars Choral and the appointment of a Succentor.

The college is an anachronism, and its quasi-independence of control is a serious hindrance to efficiency. The members of the college ought to be appointed by, and removable at the pleasure of, the Dean and Chapter. The Priest Vicars ought, however, to have an appeal to the Visitor, that they

meetings of the Chapter as the Bishop's council might usefully precede and arrange for the summoning of Diocesan synods, or conferences, or both."—Exeter Report of Royal Commission on Cathedrals, 1885, p. 9 of Appendix.

¹ Exeter Diocesan Conference Report, 1880, p. 19.

may not in that respect have a lower position than licensed curates.

A Succentor is needed who, being a first-rate musician, may have control over all the singers and choristers. I do not think it would be wise to take the only other course, namely, to pay the Precentor as such for this service, because I think it would be better that the precentorship should be attached to a canonry, and that the choice of a Canon should not be limited in this way.

But if the precentorship be paid as such, I think it must not be attached to a canonry. In that case a Succentor would not be needed.

There are minor improvements that might be made in the services, some of which would involve an alteration in the statutes. But these, I think, ought to be made by the Cathedral body itself under the power which that body possesses, and which ought to remain absolutely intact, of making new statutes with the consent of the Visitor.

2. For the purpose of strengthening the ties which bind the Diocese to the Cathedral, I think it would be wise to make the office of Rural Dean a Cathedral office. The Rural Deans in this Diocese are elected by the clergy annually at the Archdeacon's visitation. They are generally retained in office for some years by re-election. They are, in fact, representatives of the clergy. Their superiors, the Archdeacons, are already Cathedral officers; every archdeaconry, whether held by a Canon or not, being as such a place or office in the Cathedral. It would tend greatly to attach the clergy to the Cathedral if the Rural Deans, without being made members of either the greater or lesser Chapter, had a place among the Cathedral officers, tenable so long as they continued to be Rural Deans, ranking them next after the non-residentiary Canons, and allowing them to wear surplices at all Cathedral services. What other privileges might be conceded to them should be left to the consideration of the Cathedral body.

Besides this recognition of the Rural Deans in the Cathedral, I think it would tend in the same direction to attach the canonries, residentiary and not residentiary, either to the rural deaneries or to the larger towns in the Diocese; first, by making each such Canon take his title from a deanery or town, and secondly, by requiring of him some light duty, such as a sermon once a year in the deanery or town.

3. By far the most important aim to be secured, if possible, is that of obtaining from the Cathedral body such services to the Diocese as a Cathedral body can best give.

There are four kinds of work in the Diocese which very greatly need the aid which the Cathedral body and the Cathedral revenues can and, in my judgment, ought to give.

A. First, in the promotion of study among the clergy, and especially the younger clergy. Nothing, I am convinced, would be more valuable to them, and would tend more to make them better preachers and teachers, than if a first-rate theologian were periodically to lecture in their neighbourhood once a week for six or eight weeks. To prepare to understand and profit by such lectures they would read a great deal as the lecturer might direct. And very many who now sink as they get older into a dull routine, would be stimulated into keeping their knowledge fresh and ever increasing.

Such lectures a Canon might certainly give every year both in Exeter and in two or three other towns, taken in succession, in the Diocese. It would not imply a labour in delivering of more than six or eight weeks. And the labour spent in preparing would fall in well with that learned leisure which is often spoken of as one of the purposes for which canonries are intended.

The promotion of Biblical study in the Diocese is one of the duties which may well belong to the Chancellor, who, in former days, always had the oversight of schools and seats of learning.

But if the work is to be well done it is necessary that it should be done in other places as well as in the Cathedral city. Many of the clergy could not afford to come to Exeter for the purpose of attending lectures, and the very presence of the lecturer in their own neighbourhood would be of value to all.

B. Next to the promotion of study among the clergy I put the supervision of religious instruction in the elementary schools. That instruction, which a little while ago was stimulated and aided by the State, is now left entirely to the Church. To make it thoroughly efficient, regular inspection is required, and that inspection ought to be carefully organised. To pay for it requires the collection of funds all over the Diocese, and the supply of full information on the subject to all who are interested, without which information the money will not be forthcoming.

It is very fitting work for a Canon to take charge of this; to be responsible for collecting the money by meetings and sermons and similar appeals; to supervise the whole inspection, and be himself the head inspector, although he could not personally inspect very many schools; to report to the Bishop on the state of the instruction every year.

This work I should like to attach to the dignity (as it is called) of the precentorship. It seems to me germane to one part of the duty discharged by the Precentor in early times.

C. A very important part of the Church's work everywhere is now done by great societies; thus the missionary work abroad is mainly carried on by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel and the Church Missionary Society: the provision of additional clergy at home is in the hands of the Pastoral Aid Society and the Additional Curates' Society; and other work is similarly undertaken by other societies.

No work is more suitable for the ecclesiastical centre of the Diocese than the promotion of the interests of these societies. A Canon might be charged with the duty of supplying full information to all inquiries concerning all the great Church societies, and of preaching for them and speaking for them, on an organised plan. In this work he might be allowed to require the aid of the Prebendaries or non-residentiary Canons each in the deanery or town from which he took his title, and some small payment might be assigned to them for this work.

I do not think the work of these societies receives nearly as much support as it should. Englishmen are very parochial by nature, and need much to stir them into willingness to aid what is not under their own eyes. But the cathedrals might do much to create a healthier interest everywhere in what concerns the Church at large.

D. Lastly, I think the Cathedral might do a good deal to encourage and improve the music of the Diocese.

The Succentor, with proper aid, could be at the service of the clergy to inspect and advise the country choirs; to organise and supervise the preparation for choral festivals, many of which might be held in the Cathedral itself; I believe the clergy would be very grateful for aid in this matter.

Now in regard to all this, I am aware that it may be said that the canonries would no longer be places of learned

leisure as heretofore, that the Canons as they grew older would be unable to discharge the duties assigned to them, and that I leave out of sight the view of canonries as rewards for past labour and dignified places of retirement for men who have done their work.

With regard to learned leisure, I think it will be quite sufficiently provided for by such a place as I have proposed to assign to the Chancellor. A man studies better, not worse, if he be compelled periodically to produce, in the shape of lectures, some of the results of his studies. To write eight lectures a year, which is the substance of what I propose, would be no tax on any man engaged in study.

As men grew older they would, no doubt, be unable to discharge their duties. But in that case they ought to be allowed to resign, under the Resignation Act, or to appoint and pay substitutes approved by the Bishop. Or the Bishop might be allowed to appoint the substitute *cum jure successionis*, in which case the substitute could be obtained at a smaller rate of payment.

I confess that I do not think it well to look at canonries as retiring pensions for clergy who have done work. The emoluments are too large for that purpose, and the number of canonries too small. Nor, most certainly, was it with that idea that canonries were originally created.

I have said nothing of any duties to be assigned to the Dean. The Canons are now required to reside only four months in the year, the Dean eight. What I have proposed is what I think may fairly be asked of the Canons, to bring the service required of them up to the level of that required of the Dean. Four months is proved to be enough for the Cathedral; let them give another four months to the Diocese.

But, in the circumstances of this Cathedral, I think the burden of the theological college especially belongs to the Dean, and if in its development anything more is required than at present for its working efficiently, it should rest on the Dean for the time being to supply what may be wanted.

In conclusion, I have to say something on one matter of considerable importance, which might not seem at first sight connected with my proposals.

It is often said that the Dean and Chapter ought to be the council of the Bishop in the government of the Diocese. Nothing would in my judgment be more valuable than such a council. I feel the need of it every day.

But a council, to be of any real use, must consist, not of men who live by themselves in the Cathedral city, and know very little of the great body of the clergy or of the work that the clergy are doing, but of men who are labouring all over the Diocese as well as and alongside of the Bishop himself; of men who are constantly brought in contact by the discharge of their duties with their brethren, who know how best they can be guided and aided, and whose advice, when known to be theirs, will have the weight due to thorough comprehension of the circumstances, and hearty sympathy with the governed.

Men engaged in such work as I have described would indeed be valuable advisers in all Episcopal work.

F. EXON.¹

It will be seen that the Bishop proposed to assign diocesan duties to the Precentor, Chancellor, and another of the Canons, to abolish the College of Vicars, to bring the Rural Deans of the diocese into official connexion with the Cathedral, and to give the Dean special responsibilities with respect to a Diocesan Theological College.

Several attempts were made to legislate upon the report of the Commissioners; but none of them passed into law. Many of the proposals of the Bishop and the Conference have been practically realised by the scheme inaugurated by Dr. Temple's successor, Bishop Bickersteth, when the canonries fell vacant—which did not happen during the Temple Episcopate. This scheme assigns to the several Canons the supervision of different departments of diocesan duty—education, pastoral work, home and foreign missions. It may be questioned whether the scheme, though excellent in many ways, has not a tendency to concentrate the attention of the Canons in question upon the diocese rather than upon the Cathedral. This difficulty would have been met to a large

¹ Exeter Report of the Royal Commission on Cathedrals, 1885. Appendix, pp. 8 and 9.

degree by the adoption of a suggestion (Resolution No. 2) of the Exeter Committee (see p. 539), viz. that one canonry should be divided into three for executive purposes, to be held by younger men, not members of the Chapter proper.

That Bishop Temple at heart fully entered into the spirit and purpose of a Cathedral is evident from his sermon preached in the Cathedral when the restoration was first contemplated in 1872 :—

Psalm lxxiv. 1, 2.

. . . There are two things to which such buildings as this specially bear witness in the midst of us, two feelings which they seem to express, about which I should like to speak to you.

In the first place, these buildings seem to tell us of *the permanence of our Faith*; they are a perpetual witness to us that whilst there are many things in this world that change, and change to the very bottom, things that shall be speedily forgotten, one thing shall hold its place to the very last, a thing which goes back into the distant past for hundreds of years, which shall last on into the distant future, yes, until the Judge of all the world shall Himself come to judge the doings of mankind, and that is the Church of Christ. The Church is the blessed Company of all faithful people who, being united in His Son, the Lord Jesus, and their hearts knit to His by their faith and trust in Him, shall always find that He cannot fail, that what was once preached to the saints of old under His authority shall be preached to distant ages yet, and that even if when He comes He finds that there are few to welcome Him, and acknowledge His authority, still that there shall be a faithful few—His bride—the Church. We hold communion with great and good men in past days who have served the Lord in their own generation—up to the best of their power; we shall hold communion with many who shall live after us, who shall look back upon our day as we look upon the days that have passed away, and shall recognise that we have handed down to them that which we received. Here, in this Cathedral Church, shall we forget the great men in past time who spent all their energy, and all their love, in rearing it up in the midst of this city? Shall we think because

there may be various changes and differences that have marked the time between us and them, that therefore we are cut off altogether from the past, and that we are not standing on the same old foundation? No. Those great and good men belong to us. We recognise their work, and we hope that we shall hand it on as it was given to ourselves. It is true that when we look back into past days, often can we see that men in former days did not know much that we know. . . . Shall we not add that often we see, too, that their ignorance puts our light to shame, and that their little knowledge inspired them with love for God and fervent devotion to His service, which it would be well indeed if we could imitate? . . . A Cathedral is a witness that amongst all the things that are here upon earth this surely shall stand as one of the most solid and immovable, namely, the Faith of Christ, to the worship of whom it is dedicated. . . .

And yet there is another, and perhaps a still more important truth: a Cathedral bears a perpetual witness, as once did the Temple amongst the people of God in former days, to *the dignity and importance which we must always assign to God's worship above all other things*. There is much in the work of the world that we may admire and take part in. . . . We may see how the various forces which stir men's hearts are at work amongst them. We may watch the hot debate and the eager controversy stirring men's souls, and seeming as if they were the only powers that moved the world. We may follow all the deliberations of the great Councils that rule the nations, and it may seem to us as if here was laid bare the very machinery by which all human history moved. One man may devote himself to the creation or the maintenance of institutions that shall guide men straight in the path of life, and another man may labour hard to correct abuses; one man may be keen in the pursuit of his object; another man may be more restrained and deliberate, watching and waiting; and all in their various turns may be doing real work, as God would have them do it, and obeying their conscience when it gives them clear directions. But this Cathedral, and such Cathedrals, shall perpetually say, Yes, it is true that there you behold a great force that moves the world, but there is another of which, perhaps, you take little count, which is stirring men's souls more deeply than anything you witness there. . . . Here in this Cathedral shall be offered up, calmly and quietly, day after day, the worship of the God

that rules the world. Here where there is no sound of strife, where passions that stir men's souls outside seem for the time to be set at rest, where men seem for the moment to forget the world, shall they find new strength, and a new power to do their duty in that very world from which they are for the moment withdrawn, a power greater than all other powers that the world can know. Is it not the case that, as a man lives longer he learns more and more that behind all political forces, all social forces that work upon men in various ways, there lies one that is sure in the last resort to be stronger than all of them, and that is, their moral standard? Cannot we see the more we study, the deeper we look, the older we grow, that the strength of a nation invariably rests upon the moral character of it, and that if its moral standard be lowered, the nation is sure before long to go wrong, and to sink in power and dignity? And does not every Christian know, although perhaps others may not see it, that lying behind the moral standard, and behind all moral force, the root and source of everything of the kind is invariably the religious life, the contact of the soul with God, that flow of the spiritual power of God Himself into the hearts of men, without which it is quite certain that at last all morality shall wither up and become mere obedience to mechanical rules? So this Cathedral seems silently to say, Yes, you have your work to do, go and do it well; yes, there are other things in the world besides that for which I speak; and yet for all that I tell you, that deeper than all that you may rely upon besides is the power of constant prayer to God, which stirs men's souls, which fills their hearts with Divine power, which brings them close to God Himself, which makes them know what is that Rock on which they are standing. It is good for all of us that there should be this perpetual witness borne to such truths as these, and that the witness should be conspicuous and marked so that all men can read it; it is good that we ourselves should show that we are not ashamed to give our witness, and to give it in the plainest way, by making such a building as this Cathedral as beautiful and as dignified as is the importance of the work that is here to be done on behalf of all mankind.

These are noble words; and yet it may be that in his schemes the man of action did not quite fully gauge the value of an agency that had just

produced the restoration of a Cathedral destined to stand when his own schemes for executive work had had their day and passed. Animals cannot run and ruminant at the same time, nor can the same men, unless raised far above the usual level, both contemplate and circulate. It would be nothing short of disastrous if, for the sake of executive activity, the Cathedral system were to sacrifice the life of thought and worship; nothing would suffer more certainly than the work itself for which the surrender was made. Dr. Temple lived long enough to lament, "I have no time to think." He spoke within view of Westminster Abbey; and the great Church bore its own witness to a power which even the best workmen always need. But, looking back, and regarding the position as it stood at the time, who can doubt that the Bishop, and not the Dean, was right in his general line, and said the thing which *then* needed to be said? It was essential that the Cathedral should go to the Diocese if the Diocese were to come to the Cathedral; nay, thought and study would have lost their value if divorced any longer from connexion with those modern problems of human life which must be studied, not in cloisters only, but in the abodes of men. The existence of the Cathedral system itself, and perhaps more, was involved in such a discussion as took place at Exeter; and the Bishop, with his usual breadth of view, saw the main direction in which security lay.

A difficulty of a precisely opposite character forced itself upon the Bishop's attention shortly after his coming to Devonshire. In this instance the problem was not how to deal with a single large interest, but with a number of minute interests. Exeter, like not a few other Cathedral cities, contains many very small parishes which were originally dependencies of the Cathedral and

were served from it. Earlier times had not been without difficulties connected with this arrangement. They arose either from the shifting of the population or the poverty of the cures. Churches had been pulled down in consequence, or for a time disused, and boundaries had been altered, without apparently any violence being done to the religious feelings of those concerned. The inconvenience of the system had not grown less in later times, and it is aptly described in the words of a Commission appointed by Bishop Temple's successor to deal with the matter :—

The general tendency of the Church's activity in the towns is now in the direction of organised work amidst populations of some considerable size and in churches capable of holding large congregations, and whatever may be said for the more personal work with individuals which small parishes might seem to favour, the spiritual wants of a thickly populated city, largely influenced by common thought and feeling, cannot be provided for by the minute machinery of a series of miniature parishes; the areas are too small to supply vigorous parochial life; the incumbent is left like an officer who has no troops to command; and there is little that is helpful to wider corporate unity.¹

Local opposition to changes of the kind proposed is strong; how strong, may be judged from the fact that hitherto, in spite of two local commissions and several attempts at legislation, not a few of the threatened parishes still survive. Bishop Temple's eye for practical effectiveness soon saw the need for reform, and he made his first essay at legislation on the subject in 1871. Foiled then in an attempt to carry through a *general* measure, he confined himself four years later to an effort to pass a Bill dealing only with the city of Exeter. But the difficulties to be overcome were too great even for Dr. Temple's persistency. He left Exeter

¹ Report of Local Commission on the Union of Small Parishes in Exeter, 1892.

without accomplishing his purpose. As Archbishop he renewed his efforts in the same direction, with the authority of his position as Primate to back him. Reverting once more to the principle of a general measure, he introduced a Bill which would have covered the Exeter case and made it part of a complete whole; but the tardiness with which the wheels of ecclesiastical legislation move was once more exemplified—and he died before the Bill was passed. In this, as in many another case, he was content to act as pioneer, and he has the credit of being the first to see the need. His successors were indoctrinated, and, without the help of legislation, have gained in several individual cases the amalgamation which he desired, and some, though not all, of the benefits which legislation would have secured.

In other cases affecting parochial church life at Exeter success was more immediate and visible. Three new churches were built in the city during the Episcopate—S. Leonard's, S. James', and S. Matthew's—and the old churches of Allhallows, Goldsmith Street, and S. Petrock were restored. Two of the new churches replaced old buildings on the same sites. The erection of S. Matthew's involved the creation of a new parish, and the first incumbent bears witness to the cheering support and business capacity which smoothed the path for him at critical moments and secured ultimate success:—

. . . These details serve to illustrate what I mean, when I speak of the determination and patience with which the Bishop made the work to move without regard to little cross-currents and under-currents, and in spite of the fact that sometimes people seemed to lose heart—to him it was necessary work for the Church, and he went on doing it.¹

¹ Memorandum from Rev. T. J. Ponting.

As a set-off against the Bishop's failure to secure amalgamation of the small parishes at Exeter by legislation may be placed the Bill which he passed through Parliament for bettering the ecclesiastical arrangements of Tiverton. That town had always a special interest for him owing to the associations of early days, and the interest extended from school to parish. The Bill was read a second time in the House of Lords on June 19, 1884. In submitting his proposals, the Bishop explained that by the old arrangements the whole town was brought together into a kind of ill-working and fictitious unity by a system which placed it under the joint control of four incumbents. Each of these was supreme in his month at the Parish Church, and modelled the service more or less after his own liking. Each had separate pastoral responsibility as regards four out of the five "portions" into which the town was divided; but in the fifth "portion," called "All Fours," no rector was permanently responsible, but only each during his time of office. The patronage was in different hands.

'The system works ill,' said the Bishop, 'in spite of every desire to work it well. I have in past days known instances of children presented for Confirmation by one Rector who had been rejected as unfit by another. . . . The rotation in the charge of the Parish Church . . . is particularly a cause of perpetual friction. Neither clergy nor people are satisfied, nor is it likely that they ever could be. . . . There is, in fact, no means whatever of procuring that unity in action which is essential to the successful management of a parish.'¹

The remedy proposed was subdivision into independent parishes, two of which were the country districts, which hitherto had been held as annexes to one or other of the different "portions." The evil was manifest, the remedy simple; and not even the passion for delaying church legislation was proof

¹ *The Chronicles of Twyford*, by Mr. F. J. Snell, pp. 374, 375.

against the arguments for effecting a change. The Bill passed into law the same session. The generosity of one rector, the Rev. H. Venn, who resigned his "portion" in order to accelerate the carrying out of the scheme, and the efflux of time aided the act of the legislature; and before Dr. Temple's death the old Blundellian had the satisfaction of knowing that through him the town had been freed from a yoke of parochial servitude under which it had laboured for centuries. The conferring of this benefit upon Tiverton was one of the last of the more important acts of the Exeter Episcopate, and the mention of it closes the Home chapter with that which to Bishop Temple would have been as a whiff of the air of home. But in such work there was for him more than a sentimental interest; the home air must be good; from the centre at and around Exeter, worship, thought, and service must go forth into the diocese.

CHAPTER. X

THE BISHOP ABROAD

In Convocation : Early views of Convocation—Reception—*Essays and Reviews*—Athanasian Creed—Ecclesiastical Courts—Bishops' discretionary power—Ecclesiastical measures—Evangelistic work of the Church—Authorised Hymnal—Manual of Family Prayer—Rogation Days—Agenda Paper for Convocation—Reception of Dr. Temple's translation to the See of London.

In the House of Lords : Pluralities Act Amendment Act—Truro Bishopric—Church Patronage—National Education—University Test Bill—Opening of churchyards to Nonconformists—Marriage with the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill.

Relations with Public Schools and Universities.

Bampton Lectures.

WHEN the question of Dr. Temple's translation to the See of London was first mooted, doubts were expressed in some quarters as to whether he was not too exclusively a Diocesan Bishop for the metropolis, which required for its overseer a man of enlarged interests. Exeter and Devon were in a full sense his home, his Bishopric was there, and they had the first claim. These claims, as he understood them, taxed even his powers to the full: he was single-handed throughout his Episcopate, and looking back when Archbishop he said that even after the severance of Cornwall the work of the Exeter Diocese left him very little time for outside duties. But he discharged them fully and

conscientiously nevertheless, both for their own sake and in the interests of the diocese. A wide outlook was natural to him ; he knew, moreover, that he was best serving his own diocese by extending its view. The wide range of the subjects discussed in his Conferences, both Diocesan and Ruridecanal, testify to his sense of the advantage which his clergy and laity would derive from their Bishop's participation in the life of the Church at large. *It took time and added the strain of night journeys to a life already full-laden ; but the thing had to be done, and the effort was made.

His life in Convocation no less than his diocesan work is an illustration of confidence and success gradually won. At first there was little confidence on either side.

What is — going to be about with his Convocation elections ? (he asks his old Balliol tutor, Mr. Scott,¹ as far back as July 31, 1852, when the revival of Convocation was first attempted). *I* dread the revival of such a fearful power : I do not know what *you* think. But if Convocation ever gets a voice, its first utterance will render unmistakable the fact that the Clergy and the Laity of England do not agree in doctrine. And how long will our Established Church last then ? The Clergy have not yet learnt that they can only guide the Laity in doctrine by convincing them. I should not wonder if the present Government were to revive Convocation. If they do they will have the vessel on the breakers in a twinkling. There are other rocks ahead, no doubt, but this one is close at hand.

When Dr. Temple was made Bishop of Exeter in 1869, the vehemence of his early feeling against Convocation had been superseded by an attitude of indifference. Of this an incidental remark in one of his letters to Canon Cook, accounting for the slip by which he had mistaken "Convocation"

¹ Afterwards Dean of Rochester.

for "conversation" in the Freeman incident¹ of the first days of his Episcopate, is a striking confirmation :—

I certainly was not thinking of Convocation as Convocation at all, and if it was mentioned I only thought of it as a place where Freeman would meet many of his own way of thinking and talk to them. The word convocation in Freeman's note I read conversation, though it is clear enough, and though I now see that it does not make sense.

Again in the same letter :—

Remember that while it was quite natural that you and Freeman should think of Convocation, it was equally natural that I should not be thinking about it. Whenever I thought of coming to London, I thought not of Convocation but of Parliament.²

But though he did not at first take much account of Convocation, he intended to do his duty by it, and his connexion with it is a remarkable illustration of a gradual change of relations on both sides ; to the last he knew that Convocation could not stand as a representative body for the whole Church, but the fear of its stretching itself beyond its measure lessened, and the sense of its influence grew. When as Archbishop he acted as the President of the historic body which in earlier days he had condemned or disregarded, no sturdier champion of its rights and position could be found. And Convocation had long learnt to trust their destinies in his hands.

But the earliest attempts were not wholly successful. His first speech—the apologia for his position in the matter of *Essays and Reviews*,³ though brave and powerful, did not attract Convocation.

¹ *Supra*, p. 301

² Letter from Dr. Temple to Canon Cook, February 17, 1870.

³ *Supra*, p. 302.

Never was anything more perverse and wrong-headed (is the verdict pronounced by a leading member to Canon Cook) than Bishop Temple's speech on Friday, unless it be Stanley's outrageous letter in the *Times* to-day. What do they want?—a fight, I suppose. . . . But it was a wanton provocation of those who had so readily given him the right hand of brotherhood, and specially hard on those who had stood by him in the fray, to volunteer a defence of free speaking at least, if not free thinking.¹

Nor were his first subsequent utterances entirely to the mind of his brethren. The earliest speech of importance was on the subject of the Athanasian Creed. He seconded an amendment of the Bishop of Norwich against the publication of a synodical declaration to explain its language, and in doing so took exception to the public use of the formulary in church :—

. . . I think that such a synodical declaration would be a very great relief to meet the objections of those who have simply a difficulty in signing the Creed, but I think it would be a relief to very few indeed of those who object to the use of it in public worship. . . . The explanation is not to be used at the same time (as the Creed itself); it is to be kept somewhere else in the documents of the Synod of the Convocation of Canterbury. . . . If you suppose that men will be content to submit to this grievance without any other effort at all to remove it, I think you will find that you have done nothing either to remove disquietude or to prevent agitation. . . . I did not desire to detain the House longer than was absolutely necessary to satisfy my own conscience that I had not been on this occasion cowardly in pressing on the authorities of the Church what I believe to be at this time their duty.²

The amendment was rejected by 12 against 2, the Bishops of Exeter and Norwich forming the minority, and the President interpreted the objection of the two prelates to the proposed declaration as

¹ Letter to Canon Cook, February 15, 1870.

² Chron. of Convocation, 1873, p. 303.

implying "that because they cannot get all that they want, they will not even have half of what they want."¹

The Bishop of Exeter remonstrated against this interpretation, but it doubtless expressed what might be called a common-sense view, and it was evident that the House had not taken the measure of Dr. Temple's mind and character. The declaration was published, but it may seem to many that Dr. Temple's last words of warning have been verified :—

Although you will not agree with me, I think you will find, after a little time, you will have to reconsider your decision.²

Six years later Dr. Temple again attempted in Convocation to offer relief in the matter of the Athanasian Creed by a suggestion for the insertion of a rubric at the end of the Communion Office in these terms :—

That upon the principal festivals when the Holy Communion is about to be celebrated, the minister may, if he think fit, proceed at once to the Litany or Communion Office after the *Benedictus* or *Jubilate* in the Order for Morning Prayer.³

This endeavour to deal indirectly with the matter gained more support. The Resolution was defeated by the narrow majority of 2—the numbers being 8 for and 10 against.

Some years later (July 2, 1884) the Bishop of Exeter, in a debate in Convocation on the question of Ecclesiastical Courts, again pleaded for what he conceived to be the cause of religious liberty, but on different points :—

He wished to call the attention of the House to one or two things not in his judgment sufficiently present to the

¹ Chron. of Convocation, 1873, p. 308.

² *Ibid.* p. 307.

³ *Ibid.* 1879, p. 267.

minds of all. In the first place he wished to observe that at present there was a very strong desire apparent that decisions should be given by the spirituality; but he could remember (and he was not certain that the time would not come again) when there was a great desire that the spirituality should be altogether relieved from the responsibility of giving such decisions, on the ground that the Bishops would bind the Church, whereas the decision of the judicial Committee could not be said to do more than to bind the practice of the Church. By the Bishops giving their opinion on a point of doctrine it would be felt that the Church of England would be committed to that doctrine. It was true that if they looked back to early days they would find that all such questions were decided by the Bishops, but they must remember the enormous difference made by the present divided state of Christendom. There was always in those days behind the decision of the Bishops the possibility of a general council, and that made an enormous difference, and, as it seemed to him, it was the duty of every branch of the Church, as things now were, to avoid giving decisions as much as possible, and simply to keep within the lines laid down by the formularies. He could not but think that, with the exception of the difficulty pointed out by the Bishop of London—namely, that sometimes lay judges were not sufficiently informed of the meaning of technical terms,—men accustomed to interpret documents were certainly likely to do justice more fairly than men not accustomed to any such practice, and who usually looked at the documents with a totally different purpose. It was true that to a certain extent the decisions of the judges bound the Church; but they bound the Church in quite a different way from the binding effect which would come from the decision of a body of Bishops, if a body of Bishops were to decide a question. He was quite sure, for instance, that the results of the decisions of the Bishops in that respect, upon the formularies which they now held would be practically to add to those formularies, and that he would deprecate very much indeed. . . .

There was one thing more which had not been noticed, but which was nevertheless of the gravest importance. They were considering the mode in which the court shall be constituted, not in a Church in the abstract, not in a Church having no connexion with the State, but in a Church which was connected with the State; and they must not leave that

out of sight, but must consider . . . how far the State, without any sacrifice of truth on their part, might fairly claim to interfere with them. Just let them look at the position in which the State had put them. A Bishop had control of the proceedings. Not a single clergyman could be prosecuted for ritual or doctrine without his consent, and the whole body of Bishops could lay hold of that power and could say, "We won't have this question raised." If any clergyman should be prepared to say, "I will submit to the Bishop in this matter," then he would on one hand be perfectly ready to submit himself to the judgment of the Archbishop with such assessors as he chose to call in, and on the other hand he would say that the clergyman should not be brought into the ordinary ecclesiastical courts. The State said to them, "We acknowledge your independence, your independent existence as a Church; we cannot go into the details of your constitution; we cannot determine what is to be the precise way in which you are to work. So far as we are concerned you must settle that for yourselves, but you are an Episcopal Church; you profess to have Bishops at the head of your Church, and if the Bishops choose to keep things in their own hands they have the power to do so." No clerk was to be prosecuted without the Bishop's leave, and if the clerk would not submit, and the matter was to be brought into the courts, then they could only do in the last resort what was proposed by the Commissioners; they could only decide according to the judgment of the best lawyers whether or not this particular man was so contravening the formularies by which he was bound that he ought to be deprived of his benefice, or, if he had no benefice, be silenced for any length of time that might be thought fit. . . . He hoped very much indeed that Convocation would be prepared to restrain its natural impatience of control by the State if only they would reflect upon the large amount of independence which was necessarily given to them by the control of the Bishop.¹

The Report to which the Bishop referred in the above speech is that of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts, published in 1883. It proposed to leave the final appeal in matters ecclesiastical as at present with the Crown, represented

¹ Chron. of Convocation, 1884, pp. 328-332.

by lay judges, with the proviso that the spirituality should be consulted upon specific points arising in the course of the trial, "on the demand of any one or more of their number present at the hearing of the appeal."¹

With this presentment of the claims of religious liberty his brethren were in general agreement; they understood the Bishop's position far better than when he first came amongst them. He had gained their confidence by his repeated manifestations of full acceptance of the essential truths of the faith. One such instance was given in the course of this very debate:—

The Bishop of Exeter thought, on the whole, that this recommendation² would work as their Lordships desired. It was observable that a case might go back to the Archbishop for a judgment different to what his officer, the judge of the court, had pronounced; but this would enable the Archbishop in extreme cases to refuse altogether to agree to commit the Church to some deadly heresy. For example, in such a case as had happened to himself (the Bishop of Exeter). A man came to him with the presentation to a living, saying he thought himself bound to inform him that he did not believe in the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ. He said he was justified in seeking institution, as the old form of assent had been altered. Formerly a man was required to assent to the "doctrines of the Church"; that had been altered to "doctrine of the Church," and he said that this form of assent had been altered with the express view of not binding any man to details. Belief in the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ, he said, was a matter of detail; and, therefore, he should feel himself quite justified in holding a living in the Church of England, although he did not believe with the Church in this "detail." Of course he (the Bishop) said

¹ Report of Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts, p. lviii.

² "That when on appeal to the Crown the judgment of the Church court is to be varied, the cause should be remitted to the court the judgment of which is appealed against, that justice may be done therein according to the order of the Crown" (Chron. of Convocation, 1884, p. 337).

he should not institute him; and he could take his case into court if so advised, and that he (the Bishop) would be prepared to meet him there. Now, if it was conceivable that by any possibility the supreme court should hold that a man not believing in the resurrection of the Lord Jesus Christ was to be considered capable of holding a living as a minister in the Church of England, he (the Bishop), if Archbishop, would most certainly decline to pronounce any such sentence at all. It was hardly conceivable that any such case could arise, but if the court should so hold, then this rule provided a means by which the Church (as a last resource) could be protected from being committed to any such vital heresy. He moved the adoption of the Resolution.¹

The Resolution was unanimously adopted.

The growing confidence which the Bishop inspired was also due to the reputation which he acquired for absolute impartiality, and for clearness of perception and boldness in matters of practical policy. Thus in speaking on the question of Vestments he is prepared to accept a proposal of the Lower House that the Ornaments Rubric should be so worded as to admit of the priest wearing a cope provided that "it shall not be introduced into any church other than a collegiate or cathedral church without the consent of the bishop."² But he expresses his opinion that the ultimate settlement will be found by canon rather than rubric:—

I think it would be a very great gain to us if we could transfer this question from Rubrics to Canons. I believe that if originally this had been a matter of Canon the whole thing might have been ten or fifteen years ago entirely settled. But because it was a matter of Rubric it was impossible to deal with it without the concurrence of Parliament, and we know very well how exceedingly difficult it would be to bring such a matter before Parliament, and, in fact, we cannot do so at all unless we brought before Parliament the whole body of Rubrics.³

¹ Chron. of Convocation, 1884, pp. 337, 338.

² *Ibid.* 1879, pp. 197, 215.

³ *Ibid.* 1879, p. 214.

The Bishop's aim throughout the discussion on the Ecclesiastical Courts was, in the interests of peace and individual right, to preserve the Episcopal veto, and concurrently not to restrain the general power of complaint. He desired to substitute the exercise of the bishop's paternal influence for judicial proceedings, but at the same time to preserve to the full the right of the individual to appeal for "lack of justice." Thus in a debate in Convocation in 1884 he speaks as follows:—

He looked on the discretionary power which the Bishop now had as being of double value. First, he thought it was often of great importance to prevent the scandal of public proceedings at all; and that was particularly the case in respect to moral offences, in regard to which any prosecution was a serious infliction on an innocent man, and the Bishop ought to have the power to say that he was satisfied that the case ought not to come into court at all. Further, it was of great importance to prevent the scandal of litigation upon very small points, from which the Church has suffered not a little, and it was certainly right in such cases that the Bishop should be able to say: "This is a frivolous thing, and ought not to be a matter of litigation." . . . Another value to be attached to this mode of proceeding was that it might be made the foundation of a voluntary jurisdiction of the Bishops. For himself he should not hesitate to stop any prosecution, especially any prosecution as to ritual offences, if the clergyman simply said that he should put himself in his hands. If he stopped proceedings he should say to the clergyman, "I shall require you to submit to any order which I may make, subject to what the Book of Common Prayer distinctly recommends. Subject to that, if the order which I make appears to you to be a grievance, I am prepared to submit it to the Archbishop. That is in the Prayer Book, and I am prepared to follow the line laid down there." If his Grace thought fit to take counsel of the other Bishops in such a case, he (the Bishop of Exeter) would be only too glad; but he should submit the grievance complained of to his Grace, and act in accordance with his Grace's direction.¹

¹ Chron. of Convocation, 1884, pp. 293, 294.

We see here the germ of the policy on which he acted himself when he became Archbishop. But if the matter went into the Courts, there must be in a question of ritual or doctrine the fullest right of appeal for every one :—

On questions of law he did not think it was reasonable that anybody, either prosecutor or defendant, should be required to be content with anything lower than the Supreme Court of Appeal.¹

Yet fuller part was taken by the Bishop in matters affecting the ordinary discipline of the Church. For four years (1880-1883) he was largely occupied with efforts in this direction. His aim was twofold,—both to diminish the expenses incurred in promoting the enforcement of discipline, and also, while doing no injustice to the individual clergyman, in the interests of the parishioners to make discipline more effectual. When speaking on the subject of the expenses of litigation he referred to his own experience :—

It seems to me monstrous* that the charges should be so great as they now are, and I cannot but believe that by careful consideration these charges might be materially reduced. I have had some experience in these matters. Some time ago I had a case which cost me £1270—a case in which I do not think any bishop could have avoided entering upon a prosecution. It was a case in which a clergyman was charged with immoral conduct, and in which it was absolutely necessary for the due government of the diocese that he should be prosecuted. Of that £1270 something like £500 was paid for fees to counsel. I do not suppose it is possible by any legal enactment to diminish that; and if I had been fully alive to the matter, I daresay I should not have incurred so large an expense. But there still remains £700 or £800—an amount which was incurred for the purpose of satisfying all the legal forms in the first place, and in the next place of paying the witnesses. Now,

¹ Chron. of Convocation, 1884, p. 295.

with respect to the legal forms, I cannot but believe that a great deal may be done in the way of diminishing expenses of that kind. There is a great deal more incurred in the Ecclesiastical Courts than in any other.¹

A Committee of which the Bishop was chairman was appointed. The Committee eventually became a joint committee of both Houses, and the reference to it was enlarged so as to include the consideration of the administration of a parish during the incapacity of a clergyman from illness or other cause. The final outcome was the passing of the Pluralities Act Amendment Act in 1885, and of the Clergy Discipline Act in 1892. The former Act, which was virtually the Act of the Bishop himself, was carried through the House of Lords by him during the Exeter Episcopate. The Bill, besides endeavouring to secure its special object, incidentally introduced general improvements in the parochial system.

The Clergy Discipline Act secured that simplifying of proceedings and consequent reduction of expense of which the Bishop spoke when introducing the subject to Convocation, and both measures did much for the general efficiency of the Church. How careful he was to safeguard the interests of the individual clergy, is incidentally illustrated by a letter to Archdeacon Barnes:—

THE PALACE, EXETER,
June 7, 1883.

I wish if you see ——— you would tell him—

1. That he is not a Pluralist. He holds only one Benefice though that Benefice contains two parishes.

2. That the proposed Bill puts absolutely no duties upon him which were not and are not upon him under the old Act.

3. That under the old Act he is liable to be brought before a Commission for neglect of duty just as much as under the new Bill.

¹ Chron. of Convocation, 1880, p. 130.

4. That the old Act would bring him before a Commission of five, of which three would be appointed by the Bishop, and the new Bill makes the Commission independent of the Bishop altogether.

5. That in every respect but one the Bill is less stringent than the old Act in such a case as his, and that one particular is that *if* he were required by the judgment of the Commission, of the Bishop, and (if he appealed) of the Archbishop to appoint a Curate, and if being required to appoint a Curate he failed to do so, the Bishop could appoint a Curate and compel a higher payment to that Curate than the old Act would allow.

But in Bishop Temple's view the better discipline of the clergy was but a first step towards the elevation of the daily life of the people. This was the subject in his mind when, in 1883, he followed up some remarks in Convocation on the Salvation Army by moving in Convocation for the appointment of a Committee to consider what steps could be taken by the Church to meet the spiritual needs of the masses of the population. He could not see his way to advocate co-operation with the Salvation Army. Accordingly the Bishop obtains a Committee with the following reference:—

That in view of the present unsatisfactory spiritual state of great masses of the population, especially in large towns, and of the various methods adopted and suggested for reaching them, a Committee be appointed to consider whether the Church ought to take any, and if so, what special action to meet the need.

He characteristically put his finger upon the weak point in all such special action, and he appends to his Resolution the following remarks:—

I think the proposal of special action very often has a questionable effect in this respect, that it gives the idea that the work is to be done by this special action, and that, therefore, there is no need to work in the ordinary course of things; but that on the contrary the ordinary work may be allowed to be a little slack for the sake of the special action.

Now I am convinced that what is wanted is not special action, but greater labour in following out the line on which the Church usually works.¹

The Committee appointed was a Committee of both Houses. It circulated forms of inquiry through both provinces, and two years later (1885) presented an exhaustive report, which was commended by a resolution of the Upper House (February 13, 1885) to the consideration of the Church at large. It will thus be seen that Dr. Temple was one of the first to set the stone rolling, and to press the attention of the Church on that problem of dealing with the masses which still waits its full solution.

The Bishop was plainly anxious that the Church, while not dragooning national life into allegiance, should provide for its needs, and show herself furnished and prepared for them. While desiring also to meet to the full the demand for individual freedom of action, he wished the Church collectively and with authority to represent her own mind, and to give a type of what was desirable in the tone and regulation of ordinary religious life. With this object he supported the movement for an authorised hymnal, which had been inaugurated by Archdeacon John Sandford in Convocation² shortly after the revival of that body in the middle of the last century. In 1871 a number of petitions were presented in its favour by the Bishop of Bath and Wells and other prelates, and in presenting one signed by more than a thousand Churchmen in his own diocese Dr. Temple spoke as follows:—

I wish to take the opportunity of saying that I very heartily concur in the prayer of the petition. I think such a hymnal might be formed, and that it would tend very much indeed to bind the members of the Church together.

¹ Chron. of Convocation, April 10, 1883, p. 21.

² *Ibid.* March 1, 1861.

I cannot help saying that in other bodies of Christians the use of a recognised hymn-book has a powerful effect in attaching together all the members of the bodies to which they belong, and I cannot but believe that a good hymnal would have the same effect on our own body.¹

He maintained this position throughout his life, and, when Bishop of London, acted as chairman of a joint committee having this object in view. He was ultimately obliged to acquiesce in the conclusion that for the present the attempt was premature, but he adhered to the belief that the putting out of a Convocation hymnal was in itself desirable.

His issue of a manual of Family Prayer by Convocation was, however, his main work in the direction of authorised expressions of the Church's mind as to worship. He explains the genesis of it in the speech in which he introduced the subject in Convocation :—

It is my practice to hold conferences with the clergy all through my Diocese, one in every rural deanery, and in these conferences one of the subjects discussed by the clergy was the best mode of promoting the practice of family prayer. It was very generally said that family prayer is not nearly so common, especially among the middle and lower classes, as it ought to be, and as it used to be, and there was an almost unanimous expression of opinion that it would be very much easier for the clergy to urge this duty on the people if they were supplied with forms of family prayer, having the authority of Convocation, and I was requested to bring the matter before your Lordships, and to ask you to take it into consideration. . . . I only want to add that it seems to me somewhat an argument in favour of the proposal that the Episcopal Church in America has always had a form of family prayer in its Prayer-book, and I have been repeatedly told by Americans that in every case you will find that that is the part of the Prayer-book that is more used than any other part, and that a great many value it very much indeed. There is a further advantage in it—that inasmuch as we do not propose to make any public use of such forms, there is

¹ Chron. of Convocation, June 13, 1870-71, p. 306.

no occasion for Convocation to seek any authority outside itself; but it would be simply recommended on the authority of Convocation, and the clergy would be able at all times to say to their people, "Here is a form authorised by the authorities of the Church. You need not, therefore, be troubled as to what precise form you should use, because this is put into your hands as the form authorised by Convocation." I move—

That a Committee be appointed to prepare forms of family and private prayers to be considered and, if thought fit, authorised by Convocation.¹

The book was published in 1879, and the Report which is appended to the published manual explains its main characteristics. The forms are not identical with those of the Prayer-book, but the spirit of them is the same. There is much use of Holy Scripture, and the book includes a carefully prepared lectionary² following the order of the ecclesiastical seasons. The phraseology is Biblical throughout, to suit the religious thought and language of the people at large. There is sufficient elasticity to admit of the use of the book by different classes, and the general aim is, consistently with adherence to one general framework, to add supplemental prayers and litanies which will suit the different seasons of the year and the occasional and varying needs of family life. Large space is given to intercession, and to those subjects of intercession which occupy the main place in the minds of Churchmen and citizens. Many of the forms are taken from accredited post-Reformation manuals of devotion; but some were written by the members of the Committee. One of the latter—a commendation of absent and departed friends—was composed by himself, and it is a characteristic expression of his strong love of home.³

¹ Chron. of Convocation, 1878, pp. 51, 52.

² In the arrangement of the Lectionary Dr. Benson, the Bishop of Truro, was a constant referee.

³ See Editor's Supplement, vol. ii. p. 712.

The whole work is penetrated with his sober spirit of simple practical religion, which centres on the weightier things.¹

Dr. Temple's sympathy with daily life showed itself in other ways. He spoke on this subject in Convocation (Feb. 18, 1879) with reference to the observance of the Rogation Days, and he drew up a service to be used in his own diocese at that season. His speech arose out of a proposal that the day of intercession for Foreign Missions should be one of the Rogation Days.

... I believe if this could be done it would be found that the congregation that would attend would be very large. I believe, for instance, in my own Diocese, which is an agricultural Diocese, if it were understood that on that day there were to be prayers for the harvest, and that the two things were to be combined together, nine farmers out of ten would be there, with most of their neighbours. If we are to observe these days, I think it would be sacrificing a great opportunity, if we did not endeavour to recall the original purpose for which they were instituted. My own particular reason for wishing to suggest this is that, before the assignment of this day, for the intercession of Missions had been proposed, I had already, in a Charge to my own Diocese, suggested that, as it was a general practice to observe festivals of thanksgiving for the harvest, it would be a very advisable thing indeed to observe one of the Rogation Days by the use of prayers for God's blessing on the harvest. The two things would correspond very well to one another, and I have no doubt that the observance would be very generally kept.²

Bishop Temple was neither the first nor the last who has been hindered in his Convocation work by the unsatisfactory arrangements or lack of arrangements under which that assembly suffers. Archbishop Tait had the knack of conducting its affairs by the aid of special personal aptitudes, and rather enjoyed the freedom from binding forms ;

¹ This book is now published by the National Society.

² Chron. of Convocation, 1879, pp. 13, 14.

his own will and administrative capacity gave the law. To Bishop Temple, however, immersed in work in his own diocese, the uncertainty consequent upon such methods was a trial; he did not know when his attendance would be wanted nor what papers to bring with him when he came. Accordingly, in the summer session of 1880 he ventures to bring the subject to the attention of his brethren :—

I think it desirable to call attention to the necessity of giving greater facilities for conducting the business of Convocation; and in doing so I cannot help instituting a comparison with the manner of conducting that business and the manner in which the business is conducted when meetings of the Bishops are summoned, and when we have an *agenda* placed before us. That prevents the waste of time which frequently occurs here. We now come together without any previous notice of what is to be done, and the consequence is that nobody knows when any subject is to be brought forward, and what is to be brought forward. I therefore think it very desirable that some notice should be circulated before we meet. It is frequently said that we must wait for what is done by the Lower House¹; but we might have an *agenda* prepared, to be used at the discretion of the President. I think it would not be very difficult to have a paper prepared and sent round to your Lordships, so that we might understand the matters which are to be brought forward, and then we could be prepared to deliberate upon them. I had no idea of the subjects to be brought under consideration at the present sitting; but I think there are matters which we ought to have an opportunity of discussing; but in consequence of the want of any notice we have been wasting a considerable time. Under present circumstances there are members who think it almost unwise to come to Convocation any longer, because we do so little. I do not think there is much in that objection, because I should come under any circumstances. But I think that our work would be enormously lightened if we had a paper sent round before we meet.

¹ When a similar effort was made in the Lower House some ten years later, it was objected that the Lower House was bound to wait for what was done by the Upper.

I do not think there would be any great difficulty in sending round an *agenda* stating the business intended to be brought forward at your Grace's discretion. I do not wish to move any resolution on the subject, but I hope your Grace will consider the desirability, before the commencement of our sittings, of sending out a paper stating what business is intended to be brought forward.¹

To this suggestion, which was strongly supported by other bishops, the President ultimately agreed, although not without the usual official demur in such cases against useless change. "Now that you have got your Agenda Paper, what are you the better for it?" he ejaculated on the first occasion in which the document was produced. Method is not everything, but, in the long run, when a strong hand has been withdrawn, the want of it may be mischievous, and to Bishop Temple is due the credit of introducing a change which ultimately suggested imitation in the Lower House, and may eventually be productive of still further improvements in the arrangements of Convocation generally.

Such is an account of the main work accomplished by Bishop Temple in Convocation during his Exeter Episcopate. In fifteen years he had lived down the suspicion with which he was regarded when he first entered the Assembly, and gradually had built up a great reputation for sound judgment, administrative capacity, strength of grasp, and elevation of aim. No man's loyalty to the Christian faith and devotion to the Church was more fully recognised when he became Bishop of London; and he had gained his position, not by adaptation to circumstance, but simply by showing himself for what he really was. Here, as elsewhere, external influences worked upon his receptive nature, but not in such a sense as to unmake

¹ Chron. of Convocation, 1880, pp. 105, 106.

the man but rather to develop him. The record of useful work in Convocation is all the more notable when it is remembered that it was supplemental to an astonishing amount of work in his own diocese. At the end of his Exeter Episcopate he stood second to none in the confidence and esteem of his brethren. The following appreciation from Bishop Harold Browne is all the more striking when contrasted with the fact that, while supporting Dr. Temple against attack when he became a bishop, he had not felt himself able to act as a sponsor for him at his consecration.¹

Perhaps we ought to remember the saying of the Greek philosopher, which has been translated for us by Horace :—

• Dique beatus

Ante obitum* nemo, supremaque funera debet.

But I think we may speak of our brother as “beatus” —beginning life with a noble youth, struggling against great difficulties—difficulties against which few of us would dare to struggle—succeeding first by gaining a Fellowship in one of the most distinguished Colleges in the world, then becoming master of a great School, and afterwards Bishop of a large Diocese, which he administered, we all know, vigorously, with great self-denial, and with large-hearted charity. I am sure, therefore, that he has given us every prospect of assurance that he will succeed our dear brother, Bishop Jackson, and do the work which was no longer allowed to him to do. I am sure we all welcome him heartily to the first place in our body after our Metropolitan, and not only the first place among us, but the first place in the world.²

—The welcome of the Archbishop, Dr. Benson, had in it a yet fuller ring of personal friendship :—

May I add one word to the welcome addressed to the new Bishop of London? He has been to me, as you all know, a constant friend and helper and most strong upholder.

¹ *Supra*, pp. 281, 282.

² Chron. of Convocation, February 1885, pp. 3, 4.

I can't tell you how many times his joyful laughter has dispersed weak fears of mine, and how many times when I have been in a difficulty he has given me courage by clutching my wrist. And I think I am the right person to bear witness to the wonderful organisations, both lay and clerical, touching every part of the spiritual life of his people, which I found when I succeeded to a small portion of his Diocese. He left me in that third part of his Diocese as much work as a man could reasonably accomplish, and yet he went on doing admirably the work of a Diocese twice as large. I wish I could tell you how constantly I have enjoyed credit down at Truro which was due to him alone. I am quite certain he enjoyed me having the credit of certain work infinitely more than he would have enjoyed its being given to him.

It is perhaps not surprising that Dr. Temple, remembering all the things that had been, should "confess," in rising to second the Bishop of Winchester's resolution, that he felt "a little off his balance just at present, and not able quite to say all he would desire to say."²

Dr. Temple's experience in the House of Lords is not a record of a great personal success to the same extent as is his life in Convocation. One reason, doubtless, is to be found in the fact that the more official atmosphere of the House of Lords did not bring him to such close touch with those whom he met; and thus the great force of his personality had not the same opportunity to attract and prevail. But success was not necessary to the same degree; it was needful for his influence in the Church that he should be a leader among the bishops; it was not needful for his influence in the State that he should lead in the House of Lords. His power was felt sufficiently for the work which had to be done.

He soon established a reputation for administrative capacity. He appears to have made some four-

¹ Chron. of Convocation, 1885, pp. 6, 7.

² *Ibid.* 1885, p. 4.

teen or fifteen set speeches, besides carrying through at least two Bills on practical subjects : one of them the Pluralities Act Amendment Act, and the other the Truro Chapter Act. He spoke twice with reference to the separation of Cornwall from the Diocese of Exeter,—once in the debate on Lord Lyttelton's Bill for the increase of the Episcopate in 1875, and once during the passage of the Truro Bishopric Bill itself.

He more than once attempted, when Bishop of Exeter, to get a Bill passed for the amalgamation of small parishes.¹ He made at least one speech on the subject of Church Patronage, which he had so constantly in his mind and so "near" to his heart. Conscious that he was speaking to a House of Patrons who would listen but coldly, he nevertheless drove home with cogent force his conviction that the sale of livings was a standing scandal, and that palliatives were no full or lasting remedy.²

Once he spoke on his special subject—National Education—with characteristic common sense and knowledge of detail. The occasion was a debate raised by the late Lord Norton on over-pressure in Board Schools.

The system of payment by results produced two things—it led the master to see, as far as possible, that every boy, even the dullest, should be taught reading, writing, and arithmetic; and, in the second place, it compelled the master to look to the younger children, because these children were compelled to be individually examined quite as much as the children more favourably situated. A great change had come over the condition of schools in consequence of this system of examination, and in consequence of the method in use, of payment by results. The system, however, required very careful watching. If they put a man under the system of payment by piece-work, instead of payment by day-work,

¹ *Supra*, p. 550.

² Speech in the House of Lords, February 25, 1875.

there was a tendency to sacrifice the man to the work. The end of the matter was, they made the man a mere grinder at one class of work; while, in the meanwhile, he was seriously hurt as a man, because he was confined in his scope, because his whole mind was made mechanical. If they made the master grind at one class of things, and nothing else, there was a tendency to make the mind mechanical. In the long-run, he unfitted himself for the work he had to do, and that was the objection to the mode of payments by results. It had to be carefully watched; but he thought they were very far from the time when it would be either wise or safe to give up the system. There was another thing in the Code which required careful modification, and that was the rigidity of the Standards. If he were a schoolmaster, he would be perpetually fretting against the rules by which the promotion of boys from standard to standard was regulated. The master had to satisfy the inspector that he had made the right promotion; but he (the Bishop) maintained that the master ought to have the organisation of the school and the promotion of the boys in his own hands. He admitted, however, that a great deal had been done in relaxation of this rigidity, and he was not at all inclined to complain that the Code had done mischief on that score. With regard to over-pressure, of which a great deal had been recently heard, he was afraid there was some over-pressure; but few children suffered from it. The chief sufferers were the pupil-teachers and the masters. In making these remarks, however, he, at the same time, confessed that he thought the present system was working very well, and that all that was wanted was that the authorities should be kept alive to the necessity of making constant improvements. It would be a mistake to give up the system of individual examination. He advocated a closer and more thorough inspection; because he was of opinion that mere watching of a school was not sufficient for a thorough and reliable carrying out of the Act.¹

Dr. Temple's record in the House of Lords showed that he had more in him than practical ability: it was a revelation of his hold on large principles—the progressive spirit in politics in combination with higher things of which the politician does not dream. His speeches on the University

¹ Speech in the House of Lords, June 27, 1884.

Test Bill and the Law of Burial show him true to his liberal principles.

In speaking on the former subject he says:—

I think, my Lords, we ought not only to pass this Bill, but pass it with the least possible delay. Many are lost to the Church because we require of them what their consciences will not accept. When a young man carries off a Fellowship, and signs the necessary declaration, it often occurs that he is vexed in conscience by all manner of questions, which it would be much better to allow him to put aside, and consider calmly and deliberately, and without anything depending on his decision. But by the very nature of the case, he is obliged to settle such questions for himself at once, or forfeit the character of an honest man. If left to himself these questions would be settled in a legitimate manner, by his quietly thinking over them until the conclusion to which his conscience would lead him should be quite clear to his understanding. Whilst, however, he is called upon to decide under such circumstances as exist at present, it is almost inevitable that difficulties should arise like mountains before him, and that doubts that were in reality hardly worth considering should appear insurmountable obstacles, and in this frame of mind you call upon him to decide what must affect the whole future tenour of his life. . . . I speak from experience, and I say I am sure that, as long as this state of things continues, the Church of England must suffer, and suffer in a way which is most difficult to meet. They may be only a few who are thus compelled to enter into these speculations and thus decide for themselves; but they are the very pick of the Universities—the very men who are to lead their fellow-men; and to lose one of them is a matter of grievous consequence. Very often I would rather sacrifice the endowments of the Universities altogether than lose the men who are sometimes lost through the present system. . . . Now this Bill still protects the clerical Headships of Colleges, and the clerical Fellowships. But wait another year, and the changes are you may then find that the clerical Fellowships and the clerical Headships of Colleges are gone too. This is no menace. It is not a thing that I desire, nor do I believe the Government desire it; but it is the irresistible current of popular feeling; and I am quite sure you will put in peril the remaining safeguards of religious instruction if you allow this Bill to wait. . . . There is no question that

the atmosphere of truth is freedom, and that it is quite inconsistent with narrowness and exclusiveness. If you will only remove these tests, I, for one, have no fear of what can be done by the Church of England. It could fight its own battles without fear or favour. . . . It is said we shall do little to conciliate the Dissenters by admitting them into the Universities. My Lords, I believe we shall do much. Pardon me if I speak warmly of my own University. It is impossible for a man who has learnt much in that University not to feel that no words can express the depth of his affection or the strength of his conviction of her power to extend to others the blessings which she has conferred on himself. And when those now outside of her pale are introduced within it, will they be insensible, my Lords, to what we have all felt so keenly? Will they not be touched with something like the love that we have cherished for our own Universities? Will not that have some effect in softening down their asperities? The sooner we Churchmen invite them to join us the better, for we shall find them, I am quite sure, such allies that there will not be the slightest reason for what I cannot but think the bugbears held up to frighten us by those who advocate delay.¹

The following are his words in favour of the opening of Churchyards to Nonconformists:—

It was unjust to the Nonconformists that they should be excluded from that which all natural and right-feeling men would give them; it was mischievous to the Church of England that it should be put in the attitude in which it now stood. No greater mischief could be done her than to alienate the sympathies and affections of the great body of the people. There were not only political agitators to deal with—he should care little indeed if they were to remain unsatisfied to the end; but there were many religious people, both among Nonconformists and among Church-people, who felt that in this matter we were treating Nonconformists with unkindness and injustice. As a matter of justice and in the interests of the Church of England, he felt bound to vote for the Resolution.²

The division resulted:—Contents 92; Non-Contents 148. Majority against the Resolution 56.

Dr. Temple was the only Bishop among the Contents.

¹ Speech in the House of Lords, July 14, 1870.

² *Ibid.* May 15, 1876.

It may be that all the hopes that the Bishop built on these measures of enfranchisement were not realised, and that not all the fears of others were proved groundless. The opening of Churchyards has not wholly conciliated Nonconformists, nor is the tone of the Universities increasingly religious as the result of the abolition of Tests; but in Dr. Temple's eyes the course followed was just, and that was enough; and many men will think that the ideal view was also practically the best.

In such questions he was bound by no party ties. Whichever side represented in any given case the higher view, this had his whole-hearted support. He was heart and soul with the Liberals on the Turkish question, and he made his sympathy with them manifest; but his protest against legalising marriage with the deceased wife's sister was none the less emphatic, because in making it he was opposed to the main body of his political friends. The whole question took him into a higher region than politics, and the House of Lords listened to the same line of lofty argument as that with which he had so deeply moved an assembly of Churchmen.

. . . He was looking only a little time ago at a message of a Governor of one of the States of the American Union to the Legislature of the State. There was a proposition before the Legislature for dealing in a particular manner with the property of divorced persons, and the Governor remarked that already things had come to such a point that marriages were contracted almost with the expectation that they might very soon be dissolved, and his objection to the proposition was that it would make the dissolution of marriages so easy that marriage would cease to be a permanent contract. In those countries where there had been any relaxation of this kind, they would find that, even if the surface were smooth enough to the eye to enable them to say that morality and decency were the rule, yet the solemn and holy bond of matrimony was not looked upon as it should be, and was no

longer what it had been and ought to be. He had always advocated what had been called measures of progress, and he believed in the progress of the people, and that in their progress they would find true elevation; but all depended on its being true progress, consistent with pure morality; and it was the duty of every one who held that the morality of the people was now in danger to protest with all his strength, as he did, against the passing of this Bill.¹

It is probable that this speech contributed not a little to an unusual result—the rejection of a measure at the final stage. The Bill was thrown out on the third reading by a majority of five.

Such utterances go far to justify the position of a bishop in the House of Lords, and on a full review it may be questioned whether any episcopal record there could make out higher claim for the highest place of responsibility in the Church. It demonstrated firm grasp both of principle and detail, in conjunction with vast power of work. Above all the consciousness of a higher world was manifest, and the conviction that true progress depended on true elevation.

Next to Convocation and Parliament the Public Schools and Universities had the first place in the Bishop's extra-diocesan interests. He preached in Eton College Chapel in 1874, and he became a Governor of Rugby and Sherboine, and ultimately of Winchester and Charterhouse. The entries in his engagement books give simple but striking witness to the regularity with which he managed to work in his attendance at Governors' Meetings with all his work in a distant diocese; the minute-books, and the testimony of his colleagues, speak for his sound judgment and governing power. His personal connexion with the College, and his friendship with the successive masters, Drs. Scott and Jowett, drew him often to Balliol, where he

¹ Speech in the House of Lords, June 28, 1883.

was always welcome as a guest in the Hall and a preacher in the Chapel. His kindly presence and vigorous speech had a bracing influence at the time, and are helpful memories to not a few. More than once he preached the University Sermon, not always without a protest from some who were both old friends and also antagonists, but always with acceptance to the young life of the University.

Ultimately the sound of protest died away, and was unheard when, urged to the task by Dr. Jowett, he undertook the office of Bampton Lecturer in 1884, during the last twelve months of his Exeter Episcopate. This is not the place to consider the argument of his lectures, on which something will be said elsewhere.¹ Once more Matthew Arnold, as at the Consecration in Westminster Abbey, waited on the old colleague and the friend who revived the memory of his own father, and beside him stood Robert Browning. The subject of the final lecture was the perception of spiritual truth by the spiritual faculty, and in the Lecturer's pleadings for devotion to Christ as the test that this faculty has reached its highest development, it seemed to some that there was that which recalled the poet's picture of the Apostle S. John as he lay waiting for death in the desert:—

I say, the acknowledgment of God in Christ
Accepted by thy reason, solves for thee
All questions in the earth and out of it.²

In the case both of Apostle and modern Bishop, the force of proof was not in word only but in life, and this evidence became stronger as the long years of service grew. The following graphic reminiscences of Dr. Cosmo Lang, the present Bishop of Stepney, recall the scene:—

¹ Editor's Supplement, vol. ii. p. 633.

² Browning's "A Death in the Desert."

The Bishop of Exeter's Bampton Lectures were delivered in the Lent term of 1884. It was a term in which Oxford life was more than usually keen and active. The "social movement" was running strong. The plans for Toynbee Hall and Oxford House were being laid. There was much excitement over the question of the admission of women to University examinations. In the midst of this stirring debate and discussion the Bishop appeared upon the scene. If I remember rightly, the audience at first was not unusually large; but it gradually increased until S. Mary's was crowded in every part. The force and massiveness of the man arrested and held the attention of the University. I was then a Scholar of Balliol, entirely outside the ecclesiastical life of Oxford. But Temple was to Balliol men a College tradition. We had all heard of his undergraduate days, and seen the staircase where he had read at night to save the oil in his own lamp. Stories were already in circulation of the bluntness and decisiveness of his manner and speech. The *Oxford Magazine* (recently started), reporting the first lecture, said: "The harsh tones in which the Bidding Prayer was spoken called up a recollection of the famous sonnet in the *Spectator* which apostrophised Dr. Temple as 'The Hammer of the Lord.'" I well remember the effect which his voice made upon me. Certain characteristic phrases and intonations passed for the time into the currency of undergraduate talk; and increased the curiosity with which the Bampton Lecturer was regarded. But this curiosity soon gave place to the conviction that a personality of singular force and reality was standing Sunday after Sunday in the pulpit of S. Mary's. The magazine of May 14 asked: "Who can say whether it is as a writer, as a bishop, or as himself that the Bampton Lecturer attracts such large audiences?" There is little doubt that most of us would have answered, "As himself." Indeed, my clearest recollection of the lectures is the impression made by the man who spoke them. To be quite honest, many of the arguments I have forgotten; some of them, I know, in those brave days of youthful confidence, we criticised with some severity and superiority. But the man himself made a deep and strong impression. We lived—and this is true, not least of those of us who liked to be thought "liberal"—in an atmosphere of philosophic phrases (mine were Hegelian). Here was a man whose words and arguments were his own, coined in his own rigorous mind, and stamped with his own personality. We

were all supposed to be "thinking for ourselves," and were apt also to suppose that this process was hardly consistent with any decided acceptance of the Christian Creed. Here was a man who was obviously thinking for himself, and thinking with vigour, freedom, and honesty; yet his thinking brought him to that Creed. Jowett, I remember, had said shortly before, in one of his quaint and characteristic Balliol Sermons, "The search for truth, is one thing; fluttering after it is another." Here was a man whose earnestness rebuked all "fluttering," who was plainly in honest and urgent search for truth, and who found it in the Word made Flesh. Few of us who heard the concluding words of his last lecture, summing up the long array of vigorous argument, are likely to forget the ring of absolute reality with which they were spoken—"read, ponder, pray to the Lord Jesus Christ." In short, the strength, the sincerity, the simplicity of the man were the true *apologia* for the Christian Faith offered by the Bampton Lecturer of 1884; and there were many who felt its force.

CHAPTER XI

LAST DAYS AT EXETER

Ordinations during Episcopate—Confirmations—Church building and restoration—Foreign missions—Ritualism—Offer of the See of London—Farewell from clergy and laity—Retrospect.

RETURN VISITS TO EXETER

Temperance—Religious education—Tiverton—Church extension, Plymouth and Exeter—Church Congress—Reception as Archbishop at Exeter.

IN the beginning of 1885 Dr. Temple had been fifteen years Bishop of Exeter. In the previous chapters an attempt has been made to follow the general lines of his busy life. It remains to say something by way of summary and supplement. During his Episcopate he is recorded to have ordained 294 priests and 323 deacons. During the last fifteen years of Bishop Phillpotts' tenure of the see, the number of those admitted to the priesthood was 272, and to the diaconate 165. The fact that the proportion under Bishop Temple, as compared with his predecessor, was greater in respect of the lower order, may naturally be accounted for by the consideration that the younger Bishop would be more likely to attract the younger men, and that in the case of Bishop Temple, deacons would be more needed to supple-

ment the increasing activities of resident clergy than priests to supply the place of non-resident.

93,203 persons appear to have been confirmed by Bishop Temple during his Episcopate. No account of confirmations is kept in the Diocesan Registry, and therefore there is not the same facility, as in the case of ordination, of reference to authorised documents for the purpose of comparing the experience of different periods; but it is probable that the multiplication of centres for confirmation, and the increased diligence of the clergy in seeking out candidates, greatly augmented the number of those who were presented; and it is certain that the preparation of the candidates was far more thorough and conscientious than in the past, and tended to increase the value of confirmation to those who received it, and the estimation in which it was held by the people. The stress which Bishop Temple laid on the limitation of the numbers to be presented at each Confirmation—his invariable practice of laying hands on each candidate separately—his whole conduct of the rite, including his requirement that the candidates should be so placed that each face should be in view during the address—and his rule that everything else should give way to the necessity for absolute silence at the moment when each was confirmed—are well-known facts to all who attended him as chaplains, and testify to the high place which he gave to Confirmation amongst Episcopal functions. Unaided by the help of any Suffragan, untiringly and with absolute regularity, he kept year after year to his tale of yearly Confirmations, and to the last his addresses retained freshness and force. There have been Confirmation addresses more eloquent than his; but it may be questioned whether any have lived longer in the memory, or had more lasting influence upon those who heard them. He

was, above all things else, a Bishop for the young ; they understood each other. There was that in his simple directness which was like them ; and it was this which gave power to his words.

During the Exeter Episcopate some 110 churches and chapels were built or restored. Sometimes, as in the case of new churches in the Three Towns, the circumstances of the locality gave importance to the building ; sometimes it was the remoteness of a spot like Rousdon on the coast which imparted the interest ; sometimes, as at S. Buryan in Cornwall, historic memories were called up by the restoration of an old church ; sometimes, as at Otterton or Revelstoke, a new church testified to modern munificence. The church of Lamerton was twice reopened—the second time owing to fire—and twice the neighbourhood responded to an appeal. In 1879 the church openings were so frequent as to recall the days of Bishop Bronescombe—Mary Tavy, Beaford, Whitchurch, and Meavy all seeing their old parish churches restored within a twelvemonth.

None of this activity related to work outside his own diocese. It was not until the days of the London Episcopate, or his tenure of the Primacy, that the wider survey and enlarged responsibilities thereby entailed brought his missionary zeal to its fullest development ; but that interest was always in him from childhood, as he told the supporters of the Church Missionary Society at their annual meeting, January 19, 1870, shortly after he came to Exeter. The occasion was interesting in itself and as showing his methods of conciliating doubtful friends. No great pains had been taken to insure the presence of a new Bishop, whose soundness in the faith and the cause was at present a doubtful quantity, and there was some consternation and questioning surprise when suddenly he appeared as

guest at the tea-table. The Chairman, father of the present Sir John Kennaway, had not yet arrived, and the Bishop in a natural way took the Chairman's place as if it were a matter of course. A few simple words telling that he had been a subscriber to the Society from early years—an apt sentence saying that he sympathised with the old clergyman's dictum to John Wesley, "Young man, you cannot go to heaven alone," soon won for him favourable reception, and before the meeting broke up the work of conversion had well begun. As days went on hesitation gradually became acceptance, and toleration was exchanged for approval and even confidence; the new Bishop did not satisfy all the tests of the strictest sect, but, it was plain that he had the root of the matter in him. This was another, and not the least, of the victories which Dr. Temple won over good men by his own goodness, and this was the manner of his entry as Bishop upon a great career of zeal in the missionary cause. The time of maturity was not yet, but he made the beginnings in the Exeter Diocese by endeavouring to secure that the work of the great Societies should be brought into connexion with the Diocesan Conference, and that their diocesan organisation should be well maintained.

Amongst the questions of which only the beginnings were seen during the Exeter Episcopate was the development of Ritualism. But the Bishop's principles of action were laid. It has been held at times that in regard to Ritualism he simply followed the policy of drift. In reality he knew his own mind and was acting on settled principles throughout. He had known the Oxford Movement from the first, and had learnt to regard Ritualism in its proper setting, *i.e.* not as a passing incident, but as the outcome of a permanent

condition which could not be dealt with summarily and got rid of. The life of the Church was for him measured not in years but centuries, and all that one man could do was but a little section of an age-long work. Thus it came about that, though always active, he was never fussy or premature, but a steady figure in the midst of politicians and churchmen of the hour; and men got from him not hasty measures extemporised for a crisis, but outlines of stable policy. It was on these principles that he dealt with Ritualism. There was the transient element as well as the permanent. The former was a fashion which would pass. It must be dealt with, and where the law was plainly broken discipline must be used: the law must be respected, and in the end vindicated. But his main reliance for dealing even with excesses of the hour was in positive training in right principles: if these were taught, and the right model were set, in time the excesses would be mitigated and the fashion would pass; and if the law must come in, it must, as far as possible, fasten upon those infringements of rule which touched essential truths and not merely positive regulation.¹ But there were permanent as well as transient elements in Ritualism. Of these some were good, developments of what was best in the Oxford Movement as he had known it so well—the sense that the Church was a divine society, an organisation with a perpetual life in it—the sacramental principle, embodied in the Incarnation; that things material might become the vehicle of spiritual grace. But some of the permanent elements in the ritualistic movement were bad—the tendency to invert the order, to dissociate the material from the spiritual and to make the former supreme—the inclination to revert

¹ See "London" Memoir, vol. ii. p. 104, and "Primacy" Memoir, pp. 334 and 353.

to fixed patterns of a certain period arbitrarily chosen by irresponsible persons, to place the seat of authority without and not within, to disregard law and all use of the historic sense in estimating where jurisdiction really lay. These evils must be fought resolutely and without compromise; but the battle would be long, and any attempt to precipitate the conclusion by hasty coercion would cause delay in the long-run. Scarcely any sacrifice was too great in order to carry conscience along with the decision. This was the meaning of the persistency with which he pressed in Convocation for that voluntary reference to the Bishops rather than appeals to Courts of Law, which was the germ of his subsequent plan as Primate for the intervention of the Archbishops: this was the meaning of his recurrence in Convocation more than once to the agreement to abandon lawsuits, as a settled policy on the part of the Bishops. He was throughout his Episcopacy an educational Bishop; his aim was by careful training to produce an instructed Church conscience. To that end he desired the mind of the collective Church to be always in evidence—in formularies reflecting the sober mind of the Church and having the imprimatur of recognition by the Church upon them—in sermons and writings, in models of right practice set by the authorities of the Church. He believed that such modes of action would prevail in the end—the setting forth of the “more excellent way.” Meanwhile, though he refrained from prosecution, he was resolute in the refusal to countenance law-breakers. Some of these stood high in his diocese for devotion and character. He recognised their personal qualities, but they never received preferment from him, though he was often pressed to give it. Some of the minutiae of advanced Ritualism he regarded with a little amused contempt; they

violated his conception of good sense and manliness, and his language might be trenchant in speaking of them ; but he was always just, and seldom gave offence, because, though outspoken, he was never "nasty." Such were his methods at Plymouth, the only centre in the Exeter Diocese where the matter was really serious. If it be said that the results of his policy there were not effective, the answer is that the evil could not be remedied quickly, and that the ultimate cure lay in changing the faulty system of Church patronage, against which he was at war all his life, and which, as operating at Plymouth, had made the place a battlefield of contending parties, and brought many of the parishes under the domination of extreme sections of the Church. His chief fears were not in the excesses themselves, mischievous as he held them to be, but in what might come of them. He saw the risk of alienating the mass of thoughtful religious laymen on the one hand, and of throwing the general body of loyal High Churchmen into joint action with the extreme men, by any appearance of injustice, on the other. Therefore he walked slowly, and he did not expect a speedy end to the journey ; but all the time he knew the way. A mind and will were behind his steady steps.

The policy of dealing with Ritualism here indicated was followed to the end of Dr. Temple's life, and in one respect it failed. Consisting not in drastic measures, but in influence and right training, it required patient and continuous attention to individual cases, and this he did not give. There was always in him something of what an old official once called "the idleness of busy men"; if the business was uncongenial, or the point to be decided difficult, action was not always prompt. He had a special objection to a policy of worry. Bishop Temple's law *was* made for a righteous

man—but if any one did not respond to a generous treatment, sometimes he was let alone. Once in Rugby days a case of ill-doing occurred, which required something of the ferret eye to track it to its lair. “My brother is the worst man in England for such work,” said his sister. She was right: the delinquent did not give himself up, and was not brought to justice. Ritualism was not to be hunted down, but individual law-breakers needed to be followed up; for the most part they were merely passed by, and some of them went on breaking the law still more. The policy itself was good, but the author of it was not in all respects the right man to carry it out.

Archbishop Tait died at the close of 1882. There was some expectation that Dr. Temple would be his successor in the Primacy, and it is not possible to read the record of his life, and to recall the work, the grasp, the power, without knowing that the anticipation was reasonable, nor to refrain from one sigh of regret that he did not come to the supreme charge in the fulness of his vital strength. But it was not to be; and there is compensation in the thought that London would have lost a great spiritual privilege had it not experienced the mastering Christian force of Dr. Temple as Bishop in the midst of it, and that even the full historic life of the See of Canterbury could ill have spared the Primacy of Archbishop Tait's successor, with its gracious dignity, its ample store of varied knowledge, its refined taste, its instinctive sense of all the calls of a high position, and the power to respond to them. Moreover, as events were ordered, opportunity was given to two men, each in his time, worthily to fill the highest place, and the Church has been correspondingly enriched. The lives of the two men themselves were blessed by the ordering of events;

the relations in which they were henceforth placed to each other made a great demand upon their personal spiritual character, and they met it to the full. The former under-master was always quick to recognise the powers of his old chief, and to claim his help with something of filial respect and devotion; and the elder friend, to take the subordinate position and to place his powers unreservedly at the service of the new Archbishop. Not even in the confidence of private life and close personal correspondence is there a trace of the slightest sense of incongruity—nothing more than a word of justification for the situation as it was: “Benson suits the clergy better than I should have done.” Affection and generous judgment alone ruled. Those who knew him well and watched his life sometimes marvelled at the beauty and nobility of all this, and instinctively recalled a sermon of the old days in Rugby Chapel on John the Baptist and self-abnegation¹—they saw that the preacher had learnt his own lesson. The struggle, if there had been one, was passed; all seemed to come quite naturally and to be taken as a matter of course; the victory had been won. And the change of Archbishops affected Bishop Temple’s position at once: it is plain from the Chronicles of Convocation that from the commencement of the new Primacy he counted for more amongst his colleagues. Not only did the fact that Dr. Tait had been Frederick Temple’s tutor at college give him a natural ascendancy over the younger man, but in subsequent years—in the controversy about *Essays and Reviews*—the relations between the two had been somewhat strained; they respected each other, but they were different men as regards both thought and temperament. The Bishop of Exeter’s position steadily

¹ *Rugby Sermons*, 2nd series, xxvi.

rose higher under the new *régime*, and two years later, in the early days of 1885, Dr. Jackson, the Bishop of London, died. Two names appear to have hung in the balance for the succession—Dr. Lightfoot's, Bishop of Durham, and Dr. Temple's, Bishop of Exeter. The former had special claims, having become well known in London as Canon of S. Paul's, and as Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London. He was, moreover, a man who combined great learning with soundness of thought and breadth of view; he attracted young men, some of whom lived with him a kind of community life like a school of the prophets—an adaptation of the ways of Aidan or of Bede to modern life—and by his robust and simple character he was fast becoming as great a power amongst the manufacturing centres of the north, as he had been in the student life of the University of Cambridge. But Dr. Temple stood out as no one else for those very qualifications which the Metropolitan See required—force and determination of character, vigour of action, abounding power of work, ability to grasp large problems, and to rule and sway great masses of men. It was counted in Dr. Lightfoot's favour that he was six years or more younger than Dr. Temple; but the native vigour of the latter did more than adjust the difference in age, and eventually he outlived three members of the great Cambridge fraternity, Lightfoot, Benson, and Westcott, all of whom were his juniors. Ultimately the choice fell upon Dr. Temple. The following is the letter in which Mr. Gladstone made the offer:—

HAWARDEN CASTLE, CHESTER,
January 27, 1885.

MY DEAR BISHOP OF EXETER—I have now to propose to you, with the sanction of Her Majesty, that you should accept the nomination of the Crown for the vacant See of London.

More than fifteen years have elapsed since I had the

pleasure of submitting to your Lordship a proposal of this nature, and it is the experience of those years which leads to this repetition, and invites you to assume for the service of the Church and your fellow-men even more arduous labours than those already performed, with a still heavier responsibility.

I trust on every ground that your reply may be in the affirmative. . . .

I remain with much respect and regard, faithfully
yours,
W. E. GLADSTONE.

There was always a touch of personal devotion in Dr. Temple's response to any expression of the Queen's wishes, but it was in no spirit of elation that the offer was accepted, as is plain from the following words of a letter to the Archbishop :—

THE PALACE, EXETER,
January 29, 1885.

I suppose from your letter that you must have known all about London some days ago. I was beginning to hope that no offer was coming. I have said yes because it seemed to be a duty. But you cannot tell how far rather I would stay here.

"I wish it had come two years earlier," he said to his first Exeter chaplain, when he sent for him a few days later to talk things over with him; and the same tone, with a little brotherly playfulness thrown in, was apparent in his letter to his sister :—

I wish I were younger. But as it is I must do my best at my present age. For some little time I am not likely to lack strength, as far as it is possible to judge. The people here are very kind about our going, and are expressing regret in every possible way. And I feel it is a terrible wrench to part from work that I have continued now for fifteen years (longer than I have ever worked anywhere else) and from many friends who have been very kind. . . . I wonder whether you will feel a little taller among your friends at Cannes, or whether if you do not feel taller they will think you so.

I cannot help in spite of myself feeling somewhat depressed.

The same mood came back sometimes in later years: "I wonder whether I was right in ever leaving Exeter," he said suddenly one day to the same chaplain, in the midst of a walk in the streets of London.

But none the less he buckled to at the great task before him with set purpose, "because the thing had to be done."

When the news was known, congratulations and regrets came pouring in. Amongst the foremost were his temperance friends, eager to testify to the inspiration which they had received from his energy, and to the steadfastness with which he had upheld their cause.

Eager also was the young life of his old Devonshire school to do honour in Latin speech and with appropriate memorial from the oak of "Old Blundell's," to the man who had done much to raise its renown.

The personnel of the Diocesan Clergy had no doubt changed during the fifteen years of his Episcopate, and many new faces were to be seen amongst them; but rapid transition is not the characteristic of the Anglican Ministry, and the difference in the attitude on their part towards Dr. Temple between 1869 and 1885 was not the result of sudden conversion or of change of personnel, but of gradual growth of confidence and loyalty in the mind of the diocese. The contrast was a great revelation of what may be effected by steady discharge of duty.

We, feeling the responsibility that rests upon us as stewards of God's mysteries and ministers of His Word, while praying that God may guide you in this matter with His Holy Spirit, are constrained to express our earnest hope that you will not elect Dr. Temple to the Bishopric of this Diocese.¹

¹ Memorial from Clergy of Exeter Diocese, October 1869.

This is the language of clergy of the diocese in 1869 to the Dean and Chapter of Exeter. After fifteen years' experience of their Bishop, 654 out of the 700 clergy of the diocese speak with different voice:—

We, the undersigned clergy resident in this Diocese, who have served or are now serving in it, cannot permit the occasion of your translation to the See of London to pass without the expression of our heartfelt reverence and esteem, and of our sincere regret at the severance of the ties which for fifteen years have so happily bound us together. Yet, while we so regret, we must, in the interests of the Church, rejoice at your removal to a higher and more extensive sphere, in which you will have wider scope for the development and exercise of those powers which have impressed, and will leave behind them, so signal a mark on your administration here.

The address as it proceeds lays stress on those special characteristics of Dr. Temple's personality which had struck home:—

We feel sure that the same devotion to God and disregard of self, the same unsparing energy and reliance on the help of the Holy Spirit through Jesus Christ, the same sense of justice and power of influencing all classes for good, and the same readiness at all times "to take counsel together with them as friends," will secure the like results among the vast multitudes now to be committed to your charge.¹

The following extract from another clerical address adds yet other touches to the picture, and in the same way brings out the sense of personal affection towards one in whom had been discovered more than a great ruler:—

You have ever been in the highest sense our Father in God, and we have found in you an example, a guide, and a friend. The now perfectly organised Diocese of Exeter tells with a voice that cannot be mistaken what your work among us has been, and the uninterrupted peace of the Diocese

¹ July 31, 1883.

during your Episcopate speaks with no uncertain sound of the firm but gentle hand which has guided its destinies to so happy a result. We grieve to say "good-bye," but we do so with heart-felt gratitude and affection, and with earnest prayers that your future career may be fraught with blessings to you, and to all dear to you, as your past has been to us.¹

The full expression of the feeling of the diocese was given by public meeting in the Guildhall at Exeter² and in the Memorial which emanated from it. All the interests for which Dr. Temple had sought to care were represented, and the kind of special tone which belonged to the Episcopate made itself manifest. The speakers had been fellow-labourers and friends. Lord Devon told how all

Had learnt to appreciate the earnestness of purpose, the devotion and religious spirit, the fairness, the impartiality, and the anxiety to promote the cause of religion and morality, and of education. . . . It was due to the temper thus shown that there was in the Diocese a willingness to think more of points on which people were agreed, and less on those on which they differed.

Mr. T. Andrew, a leading Wesleyan, spoke as one of a large body of Nonconformists, and alluded especially to the deep impression made upon him, at the time of the failure of the West of England Bank, by the Bishop's "constant consideration" and "unwearied application," which had brought him to "the conclusion that the Bishop was not only a great administrator, but a man of boundless love."

—Mr. Alexander, as a Jewish citizen, touched the same note, and bore testimony to the "liberality and humanity" of the Bishop's character.

Mr. Luscombe, an ex-Mayor of Plymouth, recalling the labours, educational, social and religious, of Dr. Temple in the Three Towns, said that

¹ Address from Deanery of Totnes, February 27, 1885.

² February 13, 1885.

Plymouth had its own share in the debt owed to the Bishop, and claimed the right to join in the discharge of it.

Sir Thomas Acland spoke as the old friend who knew "the good mother," and the early struggles as the foundations upon which the "great character was founded. . . . The Bishop possessed the qualities of a statesman, and what was more valuable, a comprehensive, deep, and devout mind and heart."

The testimonial took the form of a service of silver plate.¹ It was presented to the Bishop at a large gathering of clergy and laity held in Exeter on August 7 of the same year (1885), shortly after he had left the diocese. The Bishop's speech in reply was like himself, revealing the humility of spirit which had led him to concentrate his administration on the plainest and simplest things, and the warmth of strong affection with which his heart was full.

. . . If he had chosen for himself any praise, it would have been that he had always endeavoured as far as he could to put life and force into that which was quite ordinary, and to draw men more and more towards the plain simple lines which, as it seemed to him, were the lines which the Christian Church—and he believed, of all other branches of the Church, most specially the Church of England—had prescribed for their constant guidance. He knew very well that there would be nothing striking in such a work as that. It was not that he valued but little the result of deep study and profound thought; but it was that he was sure that all their work depended very much for its true power upon what was done by inferior men like himself, who could only take up that which all must acknowledge, and try to make it worth living for; and if he had helped any man in any way to live more simply, more truly, more justly, more kindly, he would rather do that than be remembered afterwards as a great thinker, who struck out new ways, who opened the door to new specula-

¹ Three diamond stars were presented to Mrs. Temple as a memento from the ladies of the diocese.

tions, who led men in unaccustomed paths. He felt more than he could say what was the value of warm hearts, of kind recognition, of true friendship.

And so the Exeter Episcopate closed. It is noteworthy even from the personal point of view; it records the working out of a great personal success, and the success was precisely of that kind to which it is well for the Church to give emphasis. It was not only a victory of courage and endurance over great obstacles, but it was the victory of an unworldly spirit, won with absolute disregard of all the ordinary means taken to insure personal success. Bishop Temple went straight on, saying and doing what he believed to be right in the simplest and most direct fashion, without thought of the effect upon his own position. It was not that there was any ostentatious neglect of appearances—as far as his unconventional eyes saw how things would look, he took them into consideration for the sake of the public interests which he guarded; and he had a considerable share both of insight and shrewdness and of the statesman's instincts in judging of such matters—but self never entered into the calculation at all; he simply did his duty as he saw it. And this unworldly spirit told; this man who entered upon his Episcopate with half his diocese against him, at the end of fifteen years was—without finesse and in spite of rough exterior and brusqueness of speech—not only the ruler, but the friend of his people, trusted and followed as few, if any, of his predecessors had been. The telling power of an unworldly life was the lesson taught by Bishop Temple to the Diocese of Exeter.

And yet there was a minority who did not own the spell. The figures given above¹ may be taken as a rough estimate of its proportion. No such Episcopate as Bishop Temple's will com-

¹ See above, p. 597; 645 out of 500 clergy signed the Clerical Memorial.

mand universal commendation, and to speak of him as in favour with all men would be to detract from the uniqueness and nobility of his character. It was not only that a small minority were to the end suspicious of his religious views; nor was it merely that some, even of his admirers, were pained at times by the appearance of want of consideration (no one was more pained than himself when this was brought home to him), but such men, though they felt the occasional absence of a kindly word or act when they were sensible that it would have helped them, yet made allowance and soon came back to their allegiance; nor was it that some men could never quite understand him. It was more than all these things; there was a moral antipathy between him and some. For such men as Dr. Temple are touchstones of character, and the residuum will always be repelled by a character of which absolute sincerity and high principle, plainness of speech and action are the prominent features. It was one of Dr. Temple's chief claims upon his generation that he illustrated the revealing and sifting power of moral goodness. The test was applied with absolute impartiality; it mattered nothing whether a man were Churchman or Non-conformist, Liberal or Conservative; if he rang true he was accepted as worthy of respect, if not, he must stand aside. He was quick to detect, and no one liked being found out.

But he had the allegiance of all true-hearted men, and that, not solely or chiefly because of commanding intellect or the sterner moral qualities, nor yet because of his grasp or power to rule, but because of his great heart, the truthfulness of his nature, the simplicity of his faith. These drew men after him. They had a magnetic power, they swayed multitudes, and they held fast individual followers and friends.

And yet it was not only the personal side of his character which gave him his claim to be a great Bishop; his methods and still more his principles trained his diocese. He organised it, he brought a fresh spirit into it—new activity, enlarged outlook, fuller unity, greater efficiency, higher aims. ‘Clergy and laity’ learnt to understand the fellowship of Church membership by common work; Low Churchmen no longer felt that they were out in the cold; Nonconformists themselves began to realise that they were not without lot and part in the aims of the Church. “Now that I am leaving Exeter,” writes Dr. Temple to a prominent Nonconformist citizen, in reply to a friendly note, “my heart is more than ever drawn to the Nonconformist friends who have so often shown me kindness, and with whom I have so often been able to labour for that best of all service to the Lord, the good of our fellow-men. God be with you always, and bless you in every way.”¹ The diocese and county as a whole gained a new conception of the function of a Cathedral and the office of a Bishop. The Church began to enter more than formerly into the thoughts of the people at large, for the Bishop was at the head of all that most nearly touched their daily life.

The time had come for him to go when he received the call to London: he was required for yet larger interests, and his labours were just of the kind which become more fruitful when the actual presence of the labourer is withdrawn. For his work was always on broad lines, and he cut deep. Such a harvest as he sowed needs time for maturing. Things will fall into their right place, and assume their right proportion as time goes forward; the whole Episcopate will be better seen in its true perspective a generation hence than now. The

¹ Letter to Mr. Gadd, January 30, 1885.

reputation is of that sort which grows ; he ranks with the greatest of his predecessors in the see—the men who taught not only their own generation, but those that were to come.

O'er that wide plain, now wrapt in gloom,
Where many a splendour finds its tomb,
Many spent fames and fallen might—
The one or two immortal lights
Rise slowly up into the sky
To shine there everlastingly.¹

He is of that number, and his own Diocese of Exeter will always be his debtor for the legacy of a great spirit.

Dr. Temple paid eight visits to Devonshire, including the occasion on which his testimonial was presented, after he had ceased to be Bishop of Exeter. It is characteristic of him that when he came, he came for work—to encourage or supplement in some way some form of public effort which he had promoted when Bishop of the diocese. There was something almost touching in the unwearied importunity with which the friends of temperance pursued their Patron whenever they saw their chance, and he was gracious to the requests of others besides his brother Rechabites ;² once he went down to Plymouth as President of the National Temperance League ; once he was welcomed in Exeter by the Diocesan Church of England Temperance Society, and once he came to extend an interest in temperance to sections of the community which hitherto had more or less stood aloof, by inaugurating a League of S. George for the younger members of the middle and upper classes.

The supporters of education also claimed his

¹ "The New Age," Matthew Arnold.

² *Supra*, p. 485.

help to carry them through each recurring crisis. Once, on the eve of the passage of the Free Education Act, he came in response to earnest invitation to rally Churchmen round the standard of religious education, and to exhort them to fellowship and organised confederation. His former allies came round him in great force on the occasion, and the outcome of the gathering was the creation of a Central Diocesan Fund to supplement the original effort which he had started in 1870, and the union of Church schools in a Diocesan Confederacy, which paved the way for the Association formed under the provisions of the Act of 1897.

Primary Education and Sunday Schools had received their full share of attention under Bishop Temple's Episcopate, but while schemes for the improvement of Secondary Education had made their full demand upon the Bishop's mind and thought, secondary schools and the children of the higher middle classes had not been brought into any diocesan connexion: time had not sufficed, nor had the moment come for dealing with the subject. Bishop Temple was in Exeter in September of 1891, and spoke at a meeting summoned in the Chapter House to remedy the defect. The principle of association was called into requisition, as had been done the preceding year on behalf of the elementary schools of the diocese, and, in advocating the scheme proposed, Dr. Temple said that they had been called together that day because the time had come when some organisation should be created for the purpose of dealing with what was a serious defect.

There could be no doubt that the religious instruction of the middle and upper classes had not received the same attention as the religious instruction of the children in the elementary schools. He constantly found, from the accounts which came to him from the clergy, that when candidates

were being prepared for Confirmation, over and over again the children of the upper and middle classes were not nearly so well informed on this matter as the children of the class below them. Much of the best teaching they could have was that which was given in very early years by the mother, and there was nothing they could put in its place.

Shortly afterwards the Association was started on its way successfully, and still looks back to the impulse which Dr. Temple gave it in its early days.

Bishop Temple's educational record in Devonshire may well close where it began—at Blundell's School. Within a little more than a year of the close of his long life he was at Tiverton, to receive the Freedom of the Borough, and to pay a last visit to the school of his boyhood. After dedicating a window in the Chapel in memory of Blundellians who had died in the service of their country, he spoke to the boys in the School Chapel; and then, in the old buildings of the school, let himself go, and with delightful self-abandonment poured out tale after tale of the days when he was young. For a glad hour, in the bright evening of his life, he was a schoolboy again. Nothing was too trivial or full of frolic to recall; it was an ideal picture of happiness in old age—a Primate's last visit to his old school. The sight must have been good to see. The Headmaster said afterwards in speaking to his boys:—

Fix and store up the memory of this day in your hearts, the stately presence, the gathered wisdom of the great Archbishop. Many of you may look, in the course of nature, to live far on into the coming century, but rest assured that you will never see a greater Englishman than him who loves to call you his school-fellows.

Both the chief centres of population in the Exeter Diocese will connect last thoughts of Dr. Temple with his labours for the highest life of the greatest number. The day before his final visit to

Tiverton he had preached at the opening of a new church, Emmanuel, built in a poor district of Exeter. It was thought that his presence in Plymouth would help the scheme of Church Extension which had been revived, and he made the effort necessary to respond to the call in the autumn of 1901.

But the two principal occasions on which he visited Exeter still remain to be noticed—his visit to the Exeter Church Congress when Bishop of London in 1894, and his reception as Archbishop in 1897. In early days he was not in love with Church Congresses, thinking that they encouraged irresponsible talk. When he accepted the office of President of the Plymouth Congress in 1876, he let fall an expression which was taken to imply that in his opinion the most diligent clergy of his diocese would be found in their parishes rather than in the Congress halls.¹ But as years went on, and the more regular assemblies of the Church had had time to assert their position, his opinions on the subject were modified; he accepted the invitation of the Bishop of Exeter, and threw himself into the effort to make the session of the Church Congress in the mother city of his old diocese as great a success as possible. The subject of his sermon at the opening service at the Cathedral was "Charity thinketh no evil." It gave the keynote to the whole meeting, and expressed the conclusion in which his spirit rested as his long life of service, which had been no stranger to contention, drew near to its close.

My brethren, the lack of charity, wherever it comes in, has every mark of being opposed to the will of God. It is uniformly unsuccessful in its ultimate results. It produces a bitterness which ought never to come—which need not

¹ Mr. Shelly's Memorandum, *supra*, p. 498.

come in if our charity is strong enough. But, above all, it lowers the dignity of the Church itself; it lowers the majesty of that great creation which the Lord created to exhibit His Gospel to the world; it deprives all the preaching of the Gospel of the most influential power that can be used in its preaching; it deprives the Church of that heavenly appearance which shines before men whenever the Church rises to her highest tasks, and which makes men feel that here, indeed, is something which represents the Lord of all holiness—that here is something that speaks straight to our consciences, and our consciences answer, “This is the representative of Christ to men.”¹

His speeches during the Congress were on the subjects which he had made especially his own, Education and Temperance. The Congress was held when the country was standing on the threshold of the campaign which reached a climax in the Education Bill of 1902, and he made a characteristic and resolute stand for a steady attitude in opposition to the push for forward moves. He did not believe that the time was ripe for an appeal for rate aid in support of Church schools. “I think,” he said, “that until we can see our way to fighting this battle on the issue that we shall keep the appointment of the teachers in our own hands, it will not be wise to go to Parliament and ask for aid from the rates.” Therefore at that time he was for the policy of stand-fast. “I stand for the Fabian policy, and though Fabius was not popular at Rome when he was defending Rome on the lines he marked out, we know how the Romans regarded him afterwards, impatient as they were at the time, and longing for a ‘forward policy’ as the only one suitable to the crisis of the day.” He made a striking figure as he stood before an excited audience, the embodiment of a veteran soldier, his grim steadfastness stronger than the impetuosity

¹ Exeter Church Congress Report, 1894, p. 9.

of younger combatants.¹ "It was grand to see the old lion shaking himself." The question of Secondary Education was no less urgent, the Second Royal Commission having just been appointed to report on it. As a few years previously,² he pressed the religious side of the matter as the special responsibility of the Church, and the consequent obligation of bringing home the duty to parents and teachers, and of preparing for impending action on the part of the State. The ultimate outcome of the debate at the Exeter Congress was the constitution of the Church Central Council of Secondary Education, of which Dr. Temple was promoter as Bishop of London, and afterwards Chairman as Archbishop of Canterbury.³

The same note of moderation, the same adherence to tried principle, rather than reliance on heroic measures, was observable in his advice on temperance legislation—one step at a time. "If we were to agree on one of these small measures" (the suspension of the grant of new licences), "then on another, and so feel our way, we should not have things set right by a great stroke, but . . . we should secure that kind of progress which, more than anything else in the legislation of this country, makes a deep mark upon the national mind."⁴

The general impression made by Dr. Temple when he visited Exeter at the time of the Church Congress, after nine years' experience of the Bishopric of London, was that of a great tower settled upon massive foundations, a character maturing in kindness and softened by an increasing touch of humour, shoulders already bearing

¹ Exeter Church Congress Report, 1894, pp. 197-201.

² *Vide supra*, p. 604.

³ Editor's Supplement, vol. ii. pp. 646, 647.

⁴ Exeter Church Congress Report, 1894, p. 114.

great responsibilities and fitted to carry the weightiest of all.

The impression was confirmed when three years later (January 22, 1897) he came to receive the Freedom of the City, and to be welcomed in the Cathedral as Primate of all England by the clergy and laity of the Exeter Diocese. It was a great day for Exeter, and for him—in some sense, the crowning day of his life. The thoughts of all were with the past. In tendering the Freedom of the ancient City the Mayor, Mr. Alderman Pople, spoke of the honour as mutual between giver and receiver; Mr. Alderman Andrew, in making the presentation of the casket, referred to the leading part which Dr. Temple had taken in the reorganisation of the Endowed Schools of the City of Exeter, and said that it was owing to his energy that the scheme had been carried out. They recognised in the Archbishop one of the foremost Educationists of the times, and they looked to him to help forward the solution of the elementary education question, and to form public opinion on the impending measure, “for the good reason that he was just as well as powerful.” The Archbishop’s reply was a simple and pathetic story, told as to friends, of his past life in its connexion with city and county. From the Guildhall the Archbishop went to the Cathedral, where the clergy of the diocese, with a great gathering of citizens and others, were waiting to receive him. Six Devonshire clergymen, chosen out on special grounds of personal or official connexion, acted as his chaplains for the day; and as the procession moved through the throng to the stalls in the nave, thought went back to a like passage up the Cathedral on the day of the Enthronement twenty-seven years before, and found expression in the address of the clergy:—

When first you came among us and were permitted to speak for yourself, you broke silence with the declaration¹ that since the day when you knew you were to be our Bishop, you had longed with a great desire to tell out all that was in your heart of devotion to our Lord God, the Son of God, Jesus Christ. You spoke in this Cathedral; there are those here now whose memories still thrill with the ring of those strong words and the power of their deep conviction. We recall the scent and the voice to-day. Your work and teaching among us were the commentary on them.

The address went on to speak of the wider outlook into Church life beyond the diocese which the Archbishop, when Bishop of Exeter, had laboured hard to give, of the sympathy of the old diocese in these wider interests, and of their confidence that they were safe in the hands of one who had taught them to care for such things. The Archbishop began by expressing a doubt whether often again "the Archbishop's cross would be borne through that Cathedral"; perhaps there was some touch of memory of that former scene as he spoke the words, but he passed on to the deeper things on which the address had dwelt.

You have duties which concern not only the Church but the nation. You have to look to the Education of the people, to the religious life which must pervade that Education, if indeed it is to be called Education at all. You have duties which relate to every kind of social improvement which the circumstances of the time demand. You have duties which concern the due organisation of the Church of England within these isles, and the removal of the abuses which now interfere with the fullest discharge of her duty. I welcome your encouraging words, and the appreciation of the objects to which my heart is given. I assure you that to those objects my whole energy shall be devoted. I assure you it fills me with joy that here in the West, where I laboured longer than I have laboured any-

¹ *Supra*, p. 300.

where else throughout my life, there are those who care for all these things.

And then the Archbishop's thoughts went yet higher, as he told out the secret of his life :—

To live with the Lord, to rest ourselves in His wonderful goodness, to remember His power to sanctify our lives—those are the conditions upon which, and upon which alone, it is possible for ministers to do their work. I assure you that though I shall not be with you often in body, yet I shall be with you in spirit, and we shall always be one.

The path had been long for him and at times steep, and he looked back with gratitude. But the supreme thoughts were not with himself, but elsewhere—with the large life of the Church entrusted to him, and with the Lord whom he served. The spirit which inspired this devotion was the real crown of his life that day—and, may be, there was that in his faithful love for his friends which added to its lustre :—

I am not sure that I shall not feel on my death-bed that of all the places where I have been, Exeter stands above every other in my heart.¹

¹ Speech at the Guildhall.

END OF VOL. I

